8-2016

US strategic retrenchment and security-seeking behaviors of the US allies in Northeast Asia

Seok Ryul Kang
Purdue University

Graduate School Form
30 Updated 12/26/2015

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
Thesis/Dissertation Acceptance

This is to certify that the thesis/dissertation prepared

By Seok Ryul Kang

Entitled

US STRATEGIC RETRENCHMENT AND
SECURITY-SEEKING BEHAVIORS OF THE US ALLIES IN NORTHEAST ASIA

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Is approved by the final examining committee:

Dr. Keith L. Shimko
Chair

Dr. Aaron M. Hoffman

Dr. Harry R. Targ

Dr. Eric N. Waltenburg

To the best of my knowledge and as understood by the student in the Thesis/Dissertation Agreement, Publication Delay, and Certification Disclaimer (Graduate School Form 32), this thesis/dissertation adheres to the provisions of Purdue University's "Policy of Integrity in Research" and the use of copyright material.

Approved by Major Professor(s): Dr. Keith L. Shimko

Approved by: Dr. Eric N. Waltenburg 6/14/2016

Head of the Departmental Graduate Program Date

US STRATEGIC RETRENCHMENT AND SECURITY-SEEKING BEHAVIORS OF THE US ALLIES IN NORTHEAST ASIA

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty
of
Purdue University
By
Seok Ryul Kang

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2016
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

For my beloved wife, Sooyoung.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express appreciation to those who guided, supported, and encouraged me while I was working on this dissertation. First of all, I would like to appreciate Dr. Keith L. Shimko with his commitment to serving as the main advisor of the dissertation. His feedback and suggestion greatly helped shape this dissertation. I would also like to appreciate Dr. Aaron M. Hoffman, Dr. Harry R. Targ, and Dr. Eric N. Waltenburg with their commitment to serving on the dissertation committee. I also express appreciation to the sponsorship of the Fulbright, the financial assistantship of my department and the graduate school.

I am also indebted to my family and friends. To my wife, Sooyoung, thank you so much for supporting and encouraging me. To my son, Yejun, thank you for all of the joy you bring to my family. To my parents, Sinung Kang and Kyungnam Lee, and my mother-in law, Youngja Kong, I am so much indebted to your support and love. I appreciate Dr. John Grutzner with all of encouragement and editorial comments for the dissertation. To him and his wife, Jocelyn Grutzner, I and Sooyoung are blessed to have you as a friend here in West Lafayette. To Charlie Edgar and Joyce Edgar, I appreciate you with the friendship with my father and my family, which has maintained so long.

Finally, all praise, honor, and glory be to God, through whom I have been given all I have.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Kang, Seok Ryul. Ph.D., Purdue University, August 2016. US Strategic Retrenchment and Security-Seeking Behaviors of the US Allies in Northeast Asia. Major Professor: Keith L. Shimko.

This research is planned to explore how a regional state could improve its security during the time of its patron's strategic retrenchment. It introduces a theory of a regional state's security-promoting behaviors during the time of its patron's retrenchment. According to this theory, it is hypothesized that there is covariation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of its domestic drives to increase societal contribution to autonomous defense posture. It also hypothesizes the existence of covariation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron's strategic interests. Empirical findings from the case study of the security-seeking behaviors of the US allies in Northeast Asia support the two research hypotheses. A reader may want to test the validity of the theory against another context of a superpower's strategic retrenchment

.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Following the US defeat in the Vietnam War, the Nixon administration shifted the US strategic posture in East Asia from the Cold War confrontation to strategic retrenchment.[1] Known as the Nixon Doctrine, the US strategic posture required that each of the US allies in East Asia should be in charge of its own military defense in general while the US looked for a more passive and secondary role in the defense of the regional allies. This military retrenchment was followed by the development of the Sino-American rapprochement, which signaled that Washington would adopt a position of strategic ambiguity between China and its regional allies.

An empirical puzzle is that the US regional allies of Northeast Asia did not respond to the US strategic posture in a uniform fashion. For example, the Republic of Korea (ROK or aka South Korea) attempted to maximize the contribution of domestic society to an autonomous defense capability, while Japan minimized its efforts, while the Republic of China (ROC or aka Taiwan) introduced a moderate campaign to increase domestic contribution to autonomous defense posture. The Japanese leadership also directed its

---

[1] Retrenchment can be defined as a "policy of retracting grand strategic commitments in response to a decline in relative power." See Paul K. Macdonald and Joseph M. Parent, "Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment," *International Security* 35, no.4 (2011): 11.

military policies toward the superpower's strategic interests while South Korea and Taiwan pursued military policies against the patron's strategic interests. Why did they develop such a different behavior?

To solve this empirical puzzle, the present study introduces a theory of a regional state's security-promoting domestic drives in response to the patron's retrenchment. This research topic has been underdeveloped by the existing scholarship on an asymmetric alliance. This scholarly tendency should be problematic because the structural certainty under anarchy and the imperative of self-help make results in internal balancing as the state's default strategy. The present research discusses the state's internal balancing strategy in the context of an asymmetric alliance between a regional state and its patron. This study also introduces a theory of a regional state's pursuit of a military policy against its patron's strategic interests. Existing scholarship has underdeveloped this research topic despite the significant implications involved in the security relationship between a superpower and its regional allies.

This research also contributes to existing scholarship on the security relationship between the US and its regional allies in Northeast Asia. Each of the regional states examined in this study is known to be highly dependent upon the US security commitment. Thus it is arguably difficult to find substantial variation among them in terms of the scope of security-promoting domestic drives in the face of the superpower's retrenchment. But the present study finds such variation in the context of the regional states' security-seeking behaviors during the 1970s. Because of the substantial level of dependence, it is also arguably hard to expect that each of them will pursue a military

policy against the US strategic interests. But this study finds that such a behavior indeed is a regional state's rational strategy to promote security.

This research argues that the level of a regional state's security concern is a function of how it perceives the military threat posed by its adversary and how it perceives the reliability of the patron's security commitment. Then it hypothesizes that that there is a co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of a regional state's efforts to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. It also hypothesizes that there is a co-variation between the level of a regional ally's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron's strategic interests.

These hypotheses are tested against the context of the three regional states' security-seeking behaviors during the 1970s. The case study documents each of the states' perception of security in response to the Nixon administration's strategic posture. The case study finds that the Japanese leadership experienced a substantially low level of security concern while the leadership of South Korea experienced a substantially high level of security concern. In addition, the level of the Taiwan leadership's security concern is estimated to be relatively higher than that of Japan but relatively lower than that of South Korea.

Then the case study finds empirical evidence which lend support to the research hypotheses. First, it finds that the Japanese government established a minimalist approach to security while South Korea introduced huge-scale domestic drives to rapidly increase the contribution of domestic society to autonomous defense capability, while the leadership of Taiwan introduced relatively modest level of security-promoting domestic

drives. Second, the case study finds that South Korea was strongly committed to the pursuit of military policies against the US strategic interests while Japan directed its military policies toward the superpower's strategic interests. It also finds several points which suggest that the leadership of Taiwan was less committed than its counterpart of South Korea to the pursuit of a military policy against the US strategic interests.

There are three points to note regarding the implication of this research. First, this research suggests that a regional state's choice between the contrasting military behaviors toward its patron is a function of its assessment of security in response to the patron's retrenchment. In this respect, the present study suggests that a regional state's assessment of security leads to a dynamic of conflict and cooperation in the security relationship between the regional state and its superpower patron. Second, this study suggests the role of perception in the dynamic of cooperation between a regional state and its superpower patron when they do not agree how to interpret security environment. Third, this research follows the second-image reversed logic, which argues that the imperative of security competition under anarchy induces states to organize themselves in order to meet external security challenges. But the present research suggests that a regional state's perception of security affects its relationship with domestic society. In this respect, this study suggests that the role of perception needs to be fully integrated into the existing scholarship on the second-image reversed logic.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. The next section discusses a regional state's perception of security in response to its patron's strategic retrenchment. The third section suggests a theory about a regional state's domestic drives to promote societal contribution to autonomous defense posture. In the fourth section, this study suggests a

theory about a regional state's pursuit of military policy against its patron's strategic interests. The last section elaborates on the research design. After suggesting research hypotheses, this section discusses the case study research design of this research. Then it elaborates on how to operationally measure the independent and dependent variables of the research hypotheses.

1.2. A Regional State's Security Assessment under the Retrenchment of Its Patron

In the context of the alliance relationship, the patron's extended deterrence is a linchpin of the ally's security. Extended deterrence consists of threats to retaliate against the adversaries in order to prevent a military attack on the junior ally.[2] To demonstrate the credibility of extended deterrence, the superpower should not only assure its ally of its willingness to provide security support in times of need but also persuade adversaries that it will defend the junior ally.[3] In this respect, a regional state's evaluation of the reliability of the patron's extended deterrence is affected not only by its evaluation of the superpower's willingness to provide a security guarantee for but also by its evaluation of the patron's posture toward the adversaries of the alliance.

---

[2] Paul K. Huth, "Extended Deterrence and the Outbreak of War," *American Political Science Review* 82, no.2 (1988): 424.

[3] Goldstein introduces the notion of collective goods to discuss the credibility of the security relationship between allies having asymmetric capabilities. According to this discussion, a regional state's negative assessment of the capability and willingness of its patron will lead her to believe that the patron will regard the security relationship not as a collective good but as a private good. Thus, the regional ally will be concerned that it will be eventually excluded from the patron's provision of security. See Avery Goldstein, "Discounting the Free Ride: Alliances and Security in the Postwar World," *International Organization* 49, no. 1 (1995): 39-71.

The present research argues that a regional state uses the presence of the superpower patron's conventional forces in her territory as a heuristic for evaluating the patron's willingness to provide security support. A superpower deploys sizable conventional military forces in the territories of the regional ally as an essential strategy to maintain the credibility of extended deterrence.[4] However, it is also tempted to retrench militarily in the face of a decline in its relative power vis-à-vis other major powers and domestic attitudes hostile to a high level of global military commitment. Pressures from the international and domestic situations can drive a superpower to reduce its conventional force deployment abroad. This military retrenchment causes a regional ally to be skeptical of the superpower's commitment.

This research also argues that a regional ally is likely to use the patron's approach toward the adversary as another heuristic to evaluate the security guarantee. According to this argument, a regional state should be sensitive to its patron's diplomatic initiative to ease tensions with the adversary. Such a diplomatic initiative will lead the superpower to maintain strategic ambiguity between its regional ally and the adversary. Thus, a regional state may be concerned that the superpower may not be solidly committed, causing the regional state to fear abandonment.[5]

In addition, a regional state may estimate that the adversary will make use of the patron's diplomatic initiative as an opportunity to wedge itself between the patron and its junior allies. This is particularly the case when a regional ally estimates that its adversary

---

[4] Alexander Lanoszka, "Protection States Trust? Superpower Patronage, Nuclear Behavior, and Alliance Dynamics," Unpublished Manuscript (2012): 18-9. Manuscript available at https://www.princeton.edu/politics/about/file-repository/public/A-Lanoszka-Protection-States-Trust-022012.pdf (Accessed last March 30, 2016).

[5] Glenn H. Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," *World Politics* 36, no.4 (1984): 471-72.

will use the patron's diplomacy as an opportunity to realize its revisionist designs.[6] The history of the adversary's military postures affects this estimate. The more the adversary has been militarily offensive, for example, the more a regional state perceives that its adversary will make use of the superpower's retrenchment for its revisionist purposes. This in turn leads to the regional state's opposition to the patron's approach toward the adversary.[7] When the adversary has not been militarily offensive, in contrast, a regional ally is unlikely to perceive that the patron's retrenchment will lead to the adversary's revisionist military behaviors.

It is conceivable that a regional state's assessment of threats is filtered through its perception of the patron's reliability when it is highly dependent upon the patron commitment.[8] For example, if a regional state has experienced high levels of threat from the adversary and it is skeptical of the patron's commitment, then the level of its threat perception of the adversary will be substantially high. In contrast, strong confidence in the patron commitment should alleviate the regional ally's threat perception of the adversary, even if it has experienced high levels of threats. It is also conceivable that

---

[6] For a comprehensive discussion of wedge strategies, see Timothy W. Crawford, "Preventing Enemy Coalitions: How Wedge Strategies Shape Power Politics." *International Security* 35, no. 4 (2011): 155-89.

[7] Given the adversary's offensive posture, a regional state is likely to prefer the strategy of coercive diplomacy. This logically flows from the deterrence model, which supposes the existence of an adversary, whose foreign policy goal is perceived as revisionist. The deterrence model argues that great dangers arise if a revisionist perceives the status quo powers to have less capability or resolve. Thus it suggests that a status quo must display the ability and willingness to wage war to avoid such a disastrous situation. Based upon this policy preference, a regional state is likely to oppose to its patron's policy of easing tensions with the adversary of the alliance. Regarding the discussion on the deterrence model, see Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 58-62.

[8] Victor Cha, "Abandonment, Entrapment, and Neoclassical Realism in Asia: The United States, Japan, and Korea," *International Studies Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (2000): 269.

skepticism of the patron's commitment may magnify a regional state's threat perception, even if she is in a security-abundant environment.

To summarize, a state's security is dependent upon its assessment of the likely behavior of another state. In this respect, the present study discusses a regional state's perceptions of the likely behaviors of its patron and the adversary given patron's retrenchment. This leads to the argument that a regional state's security concern is composed of her threat perception of the adversary and her estimate of the reliability of the patron.

A superpower's retrenchment is thus an external shock that leads its regional allies to reevaluate not only the patron's commitment but also the military threats posed by the adversary. Facing the patron's retrenchment, a regional state should try to increase its security. To develop a theory explaining a regional state's security-driven internal and external behaviors in response to its patron's retrenchment, the present research refers to the existing literature that suggests that a study of a state's security-seeking behaviors must analyze how anarchy-driven pressures are translated via decision-makers' perceptions of external security environments.[9] This leads to the analysis of how a regional state's assessment of security under the patron's retrenchment affects its security-seeking behaviors.

The present research explains two empirical puzzles regarding a regional state's behaviors in response to its patron's retrenchment. First, this research develops a theory to explain how a regional state's security assessment affects its willingness to increase the

---

[9] Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics* 51, no.1 (1998): 152.

contribution of domestic society toward defense. Second, the present study explains why one regional state pursues military behaviors that will jeopardize the strategic interests of its patron, while another regional state moves in a direction favored by its security provider. This comparative analysis helps to identify the dynamics of military conflict and cooperation between a superpower and its regional allies.

1.3. A Regional State's Security-Promoting Domestic Drives in Response to its Patron's Retrenchment

A superpower's retrenchment suggests that support from the security provider will become costly. Consequently, a regional state becomes more reliant on the establishment of an autonomous defense capability.[10] This leads the state's leadership to increase the contribution of domestic society to defense.

The existing scholarship on asymmetric alliances pays little attention to a junior ally's security-enhancing domestic drives in response to the retrenchment of its patron. Neorealism suggests that the systemic imperative of anarchy leads a state to introduce external balancing in the form of aggregating capabilities with other states, and internal balancing in the form of increasing autonomous military capabilities through costly

---

[10] According to the notion of arms-alliance trade-offs, a state is expected to rely on its own military capabilities when support from allies is relatively costly. Regarding this proposition, see Michael F. Altfeld, "The Decision to Ally: A Theory and a Test," *Western Political Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (1984): 523-544; James D. Morrow, "Arms versus Allies: Tradeoffs in the Search for Security," *International Organization* 47, no. 2 (1993): 207-33; Gerald L. Sorokin, "Arms, Alliances, and Security Tradeoffs in Enduring Rivalries," *International Studies Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1994): 421-46. A flip side of this proposition is that the relative increase in the cost of the establishment of domestic programs for military build-ups should lead a state to search for allied support for the sake of security. Regarding this argument, see Michael N. Barnett and Jack S. Levy, "Domestic Sources of Alliances and Alignments: The Case of Egypt, 1962-73," *International Organization* 45, no. 3 (1991): 369-95.

domestic drives.[11] However, the neorealist literature has characterized the balance of power as a system in which international alliances are central. This leads the neorealist approach to pay little attention to a state's security-enhancing domestic drives in response to external security environments.[12] This scholarly tendency may be problematic because the imperative of self-help and structural uncertainty under anarchy makes internal balancing the state's default strategy. Some level of internal balancing will take place even in a state that has the luxury of external security assistance.[13]

However, it also needs to be noted that there are two methodological hurdles to deal with when it comes to using the notion of internal balancing.[14] First, "it is often difficult to distinguish internal balancing against specific external threats from other sources of arms buildups."[15] In this respect, one needs to distinguish military build-ups resulting from domestic mobilization drives from military build-ups resulting from the vested interests of the military, bureaucratic politics or from domestic pressure. Second, there is a task of distinguishing between the state's military build-ups as a security-enhancing

---

[11] Waltz, Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: Random House, 1979).

[12] In this respect, Levy and Thompson suggest that "most of the balance of power literature conceives of balancing in terms of counterbalancing alliances, especially for multipolar systems, which characterize the vast majority of the European system during the last five centuries. The literature on the absence of balancing against the United States also focuses on coalitional balancing." See Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, "Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally against the Leading Global Power?" *International Security* 35, no. 1 (2010): 23. With regard to the relative absence of scholarly discussion on the state's internal balancing, Levy and Thompson suggest that the notion of internal balancing is hard to operationally define, because of which discussion tends to focus on the state's external balancing. See Levy and Thompson, "Hegemonic Threats and Great-Power Balancing in Europe."

[13] Joao Resende-Santos, *Neorealism, States, and the Modern Mass Army* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 67.

[14] Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, "Hegemonic Threats and Great-Power Balancing in Europe, 1495-1999," *Security Studies* 14, no. 1 (2005): 14

[15] Levy and Thompson, "Balancing on Land and at Sea," 23.

strategy and the state's tendency to ratchet up the competitive level of military capabilities.

While acknowledging the methodological hurdles above, the present research characterizes the internal balancing strategy as the state's strategy to increase societal contribution to an autonomous defense posture in response to its patron's strategic retrenchment. This characterization refers to existing scholarship that suggests that political leaders must draw on domestic society and economy for popular support and required material resources. Classical realists acknowledge that the nature of state-society relationship is vital to the conduct of internal balancing strategy. According to them, "Power over opinion is … … not less essential for political purposes than military and economic power, and has always been closely associated with them. The art of persuasion has always been a necessary part of the equipment of a political leader."[16] It was also argued that "The quality of government is patently a source of strength or weakness with respect to most of the factors upon which national power depends, especially in view of the influence the government exerts upon natural resources, industrial capacity, and military preparedness."[17] Yet the classical realists leave aside systemic analysis of how internal balancing strategy is influenced by the state's relationship with domestic society.

This analysis has been substantially addressed by the neoclassical realist literature, which suggests the need to study how a state's response to international challenges and opportunities is translated through the state's capacity to direct domestic human and

---

[16] Edward H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (London: Macmillan & Co, 1964), 132.
[17] Morgenthau, Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Knopf, 1966), 154.

material resources for national security purposes. For example, Fareed Zakaria traces the US's rapid international expansion between 1899 and 1980 to an increase in the state's capacity to direct domestic resources for national security objectives. This increase in extractive capacity is attributed to the emergence of a strong state vis-à-vis its domestic society.[18] Aaron Friedberg's study of the United States and the Soviet Union during the early Cold War era also discusses how the state-society relationship of the two great powers affected their strategies of military preparedness against each other.[19] Like his fellow neoclassical realists, Randall Schweller explores how a state's relationship with domestic society affects the state's capacity to drive domestic mobilization campaigns for military preparedness against external threats. According to him, legitimate states are likely to possess a high level of policy capacity in mobilizing and extracting national resources for national security objectives. In contrast, policymakers are likely to have less capacity in directing domestic resources for national security purposes when the state's relationship to society is weak.[20]

---

[18] Fareed Zakaria, *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).

[19] Friedberg's study of the United States' strategy of military preparedness against the Soviet Union found that the state's power over domestic society and economy was substantially limited during the early period of the Cold War. This induced the United States to take the "outward-directed force posture and military strategy" and "a supporting set of inward-directed power-creating mechanisms." The Soviet Union, on the other hand, did not witness countervailing domestic constraint on the state's ability to direct domestic resources for military preparedness. This led the state to militarize its domestic society, which enabled the state to compete with the United States on a global scale. The end result of this "true garrison state," however, was the collapse and disintegration of the Soviet Union. See Aaron L. Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 341; Aaron L. Friedberg, "Why Didn't the United States become a Garrison State?" *International Security* 16, no. 4 (1992): 141.

[20] Randall L. Schweller, *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 45-54.

The neoclassical realist literature examines how a state's relationship with domestic society affects its internal balancing strategy against external threats.[21] In this respect, it follows the suggestion that one should explorer how a state's relationship with domestic society influences security-seeking behaviors shown by states.[22] While acknowledging the neoclassical realist conclusion, this research alternatively explores how a state's external security environments affect its capacity to direct national resources for military preparedness against external threats.

This alternative approach is based upon a survey of existing literature that endorses the notion that external pressures shape a state's internal structure. Gerschenkron explored how domestic structures of states are influenced by the timing of industrialization and the pressure of the international system.[23] Drawing on Gerschenkron's discussion, Moore argued that the pressure from an international system and the timing of industrialization led to the development of three possible modes of modernization: democratic, fascist, and communist.[24] After reviewing these studies, Gourevitch introduced the notion of second-image reversed logic, which argues that anarchy-driven security competition "induces states to organize themselves internally so as to meet these external challenges."[25] Michael Desch finds that war and external

---

[21] This approach can be endorsed by a group of studies discussing how a state's relationship with domestic society affects the state's foreign economic policy. Regarding this point, see Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24, no.2 (1999): 5-55.

[22] Matthew Evangelista, "Issue-Area and Foreign Policy Revisited." *International Organization* 43, no.1 (1989): 147-71.

[23] Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1962).

[24] Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

[25] Peter Gourevitch, "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics," *International Organization* 32, no. 4 (1978): 896. Introducing this notion, he examined how the state

threats led to the expansion of the state's scope and to the increased cohesion of the state.[26] Resende-Santos introduces the second image reversed logic into his critical review of Waltz's version of neorealism and argues that anarchy-driven competition forces each state to adopt the strategy of military emulation, which in turn leads to the restructuring of the state's central fiscal-administrative-coercive apparatus.[27]

To establish a theory of a regional state's internal balancing strategy in response to its patron's strategic retrenchment, the present study integrates the role of perception into the existing scholarship on the second-image reversed logic. A regional state's security concern in the face of the patron's retrenchment shows how systemic pressure of international anarchy affects its security assessment. Uncertainty and insecurity are inherent in international anarchy. This suggests that a state's security is contingent upon its assessment of the likely behavior of another state. A superpower's retrenchment may make its junior ally distrustful of the patron's commitment. In addition, the security provider's retrenchment may affect its ally's threat perception of the adversary. A regional state is thus supposed to organize itself internally in the face of the patron's retrenchment based upon its security assessment.

The present study should hypothesize a causal link between a regional state's security concern and its efforts to increase societal contribution to autonomous defense. For this purpose, this study refers to Michael Barnett's discussion on the state's strategy

---

domestic structure is affected by the following two factors at factors at the level of international politics: the distribution of power among states and the distribution of wealth and economic activity.

[26] Michael C. Desch, "War and Strong States, Peace and Weak States?" *International Organization* 50, no. 2 (1996): 237-68.

[27] Resende-Santos, *Neorealism, States, and the Modern Mass Army*.

for military preparedness.[28] He discusses three types of strategy: namely, accommodational, restructural, and international strategy.

The essence of an accommodational strategy is that political leaders restrict selection of policy instruments for military preparedness to those which are presently contained in its central apparatus. States will invariably initiate this strategy because there are few domestic political costs to conducting it. As international pressure increases, however, states' needs for security are unlikely to be met through the strategy of accommodation. This leads political leaders to look for either a restructural strategy, defined as the state's attempt to restructure its present compact with society so as to increase the domestic contribution for national security, or international strategy, defined as the state' attempt to distribute the costs of balancing strategy onto foreign states.[29]

Political leaders are likely to introduce international strategy when the state's relationship with its economy and society is constrained as they find it difficult to impose costs attached to state's military preparedness on domestic society. Foreign assistance, whereas, places restrictions on the recipient's security-related policies that the aid donor regards as contrary to its own strategic interests. Conversely, a state that has the capabilities to redeploy internal resources and impose the costs of increasing national security on society is likely to introduce the restructural strategy. Introducing this

---

[28] Michael N. Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics: The Domestic and Systemic Sources of Israeli Security Policy, 1967-1977." *World Politics* 42, no.4 (1990): 529-62.

[29] Barnett discusses two forms of the state's restructural strategy. One is a "centralization scenarios" in which "the state intervenes and increases its direct control over societal resources." This is when the state introduces direct taxation, moves from the reliance on a mercenary army to the establishment of a standing army, or nationalization of key economic sectors. The other form of the restructural strategy involves the expansion of the state's material base by unleashing market forces for increasing productive activity. See Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 543.

domestic offensive strategy, however, comes with societal resistance and the cost of establishing expensive administrative apparatus to control a domestic society.[30]

Barnett's discussion suggests that political leaders are unlikely to make efforts to increase domestic contribution for military preparedness when the state is not vulnerable to external security environment. In contrast, they are supposed to make efforts to increase domestic contribution for military build-ups as the state's external vulnerability increases, particularly when the state does not have an alternative source of international support for its security and when political leaders are not constrained by domestic resistance against drives for directing national resources toward military preparedness.

The present study integrates the role of perception into the study of a state's strategy for military preparedness. Accordingly, it is theorized that there is co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern under its patron's strategic retrenchment and the scope of the state's efforts to increase societal contribution to an autonomous defense capability.[31] According to this theory, it is hypothesized that the more negatively a regional state estimates its security in the face of the patron's retrenchment, the more it

---

[30] Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 543-44.

[31] This theory can be endorsed by the argument that variation in the state's external pressure leads to variation in the state's security-promoting domestic strategy, which in turn leads to variation in the state's domestic political structure. The much cited case to illustrate this argument is the geographical differences between England and Prussia in the 17th century. The existence of the English Channel substantially lessened the chances of invasion. This geographical condition induced England into maintaining a navy, instead of constituting a standing army and mobilizing domestic resources to sustain it. A navy force could not be used for domestic repression. Consequently, the absence of military tools for domestic repression facilitated the development of a constitutional, liberal political order in England. In contrast, Prussia was very vulnerable to geopolitical location in the sense that there was nothing natural that lessened the chances of invasion. This geographical condition in turn led Prussia to establish a standing army, which was not supervised by representative bodies. This in turn led to the emergence of the garrison state. Regarding the geographical differences between England and Prussia, see Peter Gourevitch, "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics," *International Organization* 32, no. 4 (1978): 896.

is willing to increase its societal contribution to defense. It is also hypothesized that the less negatively a regional state estimates the security implications of the security guarantor's strategic posture, the less it is willing to increase the security burden on domestic society.

1.4. A Regional State's Military Behaviors against the Strategic Interests of Its Patron

There are several cases in which a superpower's strategic interests are jeopardized by the military behaviors of its regional allies. For example, a regional state's offensive military behaviors will negatively affect the patron's strategic interest to establish peaceful status-quo. Another example is a regional state's pursuit of nuclear weapons that place a superpower's strategy of nonproliferation at risk. A superpower must deal with the regional state's military behaviors that will jeopardize its strategic interests or risk a loss of control over the junior ally. Despite the significant implications involved in the alliance between a superpower and its regional allies, existing scholarship is underdeveloped to explain why a regional ally pursues military behaviors against the patron's strategic interests.

For instance, this question remains an empirical puzzle for a group of studies that emphasize the tendency toward policy coordination between a regional ally and its patron. A third party to the alliance is supposed to judge the commitment of the allies to one another via the similarity of their foreign policies. Thus, allies are likely to look for intra-alliance solidarity in their foreign policy in order to send a signal to a third party

that their alliance is a credible one.[32] From this perspective, a regional state is supposed to develop its military policies in line with its patron's strategic interests.

A regional state's engagement in military behaviors against its patron is also a puzzle for studies characterizing an alliance between asymmetric capabilities as pacts-of-restraint, through one in which the stronger party manages the behaviors of its weaker partner.[33] According to this scholarship, a superpower has the capability to manage its regional allies so as to prevent them from pursuing military behaviors that will negatively affect its strategic interests. It is also able to punish the junior allies' pursuit of objectionable military behaviors by coercive threats.[34] Considering the pact-of-restraint aspect of the alliance, it is still puzzling why a regional state would pursue a military

---

[32] James D. Morrow, "Alliances: Why Write Them Down?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 3 (June 2000): 69-70; Walt, "Why alliances endure or collapse," 164.

[33] Osgood points out that the most prominent function of an asymmetric alliance is to control and restrain its relatively weak ally. In this regard, Gelpi envisions an asymmetric alliance as an institutional mechanism through which a relatively weak ally is forced to keep its foreign policy favorable to its relatively strong alliance partner. Ikenberry's case study of the security relationship between the U.S. and its regional allies during the early era of the Cold War similarly envisions U.S. military alliances, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the U.S.-Japan security treaty, as institutional mechanisms through which the hegemonic state was able to lock its regional allies into a postwar order that it favored. Such a restraining influence has also been focused on by a strand of the literature which discusses the dual-containment character of an asymmetric alliance between a superpower state and her regional allies, such as Germany and Japan. See Robert E. Osgood, *Alliances and American Foreign Policy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1968), 22; Christopher Gelpi, "Alliances as Instruments of Intra-Allied Control," in *Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions over Time and Space*, eds. Helga Haftendorn, Robert. O. Keohane, and Celeste A. Wallander (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 107-139; John G. Ikenberry, *After Victory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001). According to the literature, the asymmetric alliance not only serves to balance external threats, but also offers mechanism and venues through which a superpower state is able to control the security policy of its regional allies in order to make the international environment more predictable and stable. Regarding US dual-containment strategy toward Germany and Japan, see Timothy. D. Temerson, *Double Containment and the Origins of the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance* (Center for International Studies. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992), http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/17094/JP-WP-91-14-25982229.pdf?sequence=1; Thomas A. Schwartz, "The United States and Germany after 1945: Alliances, Transnational Relations, and the Legacy of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 19, no. 4 (1995): 549-68.

[34] Gelpi, "Alliances as Instruments of Intra-Allied Control"; Nicholas L. Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions." *International Organization* 68, no. 4 (2014): 913-44.

policy against the patron's strategic interests, which could prompt coercive threats from the patron to reverse them.

From the perspective of the existing scholarship, a regional state's pursuit of military policy against its patron's strategic interests is characterized as the state's irrational behavior, which can be explained by the state's domestic political structure or the existence of reckless political leaders.[35] To establish a theory of the regional state's military behaviors against its patron, however, this study alternatively argues that the notion of rationality should be fully considered in the study of a regional state's military behaviors against its patron's strategic interests. This leads to the characterization of the regional state's military behavior against its patron as the state's rational strategy to promote security.

To discuss a regional state's military behaviors against its patron, the present research refers to the existing scholarship to explain why a regional state pursues an independent nuclear weapons capability despite the existence of the nuclear protection of its patron. The patron's commitment to a nuclear umbrella may be sufficient for a regional ally to dampen its security concern. Thus such a regional ally is unlikely to engage in nuclear behavior, which jeopardizes its patron's strategic interests of non-proliferation.[36] In this respect, it is puzzling why a regional ally that enjoys nuclear protection of its patron pursues an independent nuclear weapons capability, which could prompt coercive threats from the patron to reverse the objectionable military policy. To

---

[35] Victor Cha, "Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia," *International Security* 34, no.3 (2009/10): 158-96.

[36] Dong-Joon Jo and Erik Gartzke, "Determinants of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51, no.1 (2007): 170.

resolve this empirical puzzle, one may argue the nuclear behavior as the junior ally's strategy that targets not only to secure its security but also to have leverage in negotiation with its patron regarding the terms of the patron's security guarantee.[37]

While referring to this argument, this research characterizes a regional state's pursuit of military policies against the patron's strategic interests as a form of that state's strategy to put pressure on the superpower. This characterization helps to explain why a regional state pursues such adventurous military policies that may prompt the patron to engage in coercive punishment. But the existing scholarship on a regional state's nuclear behavior does not explain why a regional state develops its military policies in line with the strategic interests of its patron while another regional ally pursues a military policy against the patron's strategic interests.

This research theorizes that the level of a regional state's commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron is a function its security assessment during the security provider's retrenchment. According to this theory, a regional state is supposed to maintain deferential behaviors toward its patron because this will raise the reputational costs the security provider will pay for retrenchment.[38] As its security concern increases under its patron's retrenchment, however, it should find a way to pressure the superpower to reverse the course. For this purpose, a regional ally pursues a military policy that will jeopardize the patron's strategic interests. This suggests that there is covariation between

---

[37] Lanoszka, "Protection States Trust?"
[38] Cha, "Abandonment, Entrapment, and Neoclassical Realism in Asia," 266; Goldstein, "Discounting the Free Ride," 45.

the level of a regional state's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron.

According to the theory, it is hypothesized that the more negatively a regional state assesses its security in response to its patron's retrenchment, the more it is hypothesized to be committed to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron's strategic interests. In contrast, the less negatively a regional ally assesses the security provider's retrenchment, the less it is hypothesized to be committed to pursuing a military policy against the strategic interests of its patron.

1.5. Research Design

1.5.1. Research Hypotheses

Test of the research hypotheses follows the "congruence method," which suggests that in order to identify a causal effect between independent and dependent variables, one must begin with a theory positing the temporal co-variation between the variables and then assess the validity of the theory against historical cases.[39] First, this study expects to find co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of its drives to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability (Hypothesis 1). Second, the present research expects to find covariation between the level of a regional state's negative assessment of security and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against the strategic interests of its superpower patron (Hypothesis 2).

Hypothesis 1: *The more negatively a regional state estimates its security in the face of its patron's retrenchment, the more it launches domestic drives to increase the societal contribution toward an autonomous defense capability. In contrast, the less negatively a regional state estimates the security implications of the patron's retrenchment, the less it introduces domestic drives to establish military capability for self-defense.*

Hypothesis 2: *The more negatively a regional state estimates its security in response to the patron's retrenchment, the more it is committed to pursuing a military policy that jeopardizes the strategic interests of the security provider. In contrast, the less negatively a regional state estimates the patron's retrenchment, the less it is committed to the pursuit of a military policy against the security guarantor's strategic interests.*

---

[39] Alexander L George and Andrew Bennett*, Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005), 181-204.

1.5.2. Case Selection

The research hypotheses are tested against the context of how the US regional allies in Northeast Asia, namely Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, responded to the Nixon Administration's strategic retrenchment in Northeast Asia during the 1970s.[40] The Nixon Doctrine is known as the most representative instance of U.S. retrenchment in Northeast Asia. According to this doctrine, each of the US allies should be in charge of its own military defense in general, and the US would have acted as a nuclear umbrella if requested.[41] This military retrenchment reflects the US need to look for a more passive and secondary role in the defense of its regional allies. The retrenchment was followed by the Nixon Administration's announcement of the achievement of rapprochement with the People's Republic of China (PRC or aka China), which signaled that the US would adopt a position of strategic ambiguity between China and its regional allies in Northeast Asia.

Table 1-1. The US Troop Level in Japan, ROK, and ROC, 1969-1976.[42]

	1969	**1970**	**1971**	**1972**	**1973**	**1974**	**1975**	**1976**
Japan	84,802	82,264	71,485	61,747	56,240	51,608	48,337	46,794
ROK	66,531	52,197	40,740	41,600	41,864	40,387	40,204	39,133
ROC	9,243	8,813	8,565	8,289	8,267	4,619	2,584	2,090

[40] The present study uses the term Republic of Korea (ROK) and South Korea interchangeably for a stylistic purpose. It also uses the term Republic of China (ROC) and Taiwan interchangeably.
[41] Earl G. Ravenal, "The Nixon Doctrine and Our Asian Commitments," *Foreign Affairs* 49, no. 2 (1971): 201-17.
[42] http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2004/10/global-us-troop-deployment-1950-2003 (Accessed March 29, 2016).

Each of the three regional states is arguably a hard case to use in supporting the theory about a regional state's security-enhancing domestic drives.[43] The US's Cold War strategy in Northeast Asia was to create a hub-and-spokes system, with the United States as the hub and no apparent institutionalized military cooperation between the spokes. The absence of institutionalized cooperation, coupled with the bipolar nature of the period examined in the case study, suggests that each of the states was highly dependent upon the US's security commitment. Thus, it is arguably difficult to find substantial variation among them in terms of the scope of security-promoting domestic drives in the face of the US retrenchment.

In addition, because of their dependence on the United States, the three states were not supposed to engage in military behaviors that were against the strategic interests of the United States, which could conceivably prompt U.S. retaliation. Furthermore, the existing scholarship on the Cold War diplomatic history finds that the alliance between US and the regional allies worked as institutional mechanism to prevent the junior allies from provoking a larger military conflict that might spoil the patron's strategic interests.[44] Thus, the selected states are also hard cases to use in supporting the argument that a

---

[43] The case selection follows the suggestion that a qualitative case study needs to use hard case(s) in supporting its own theory. See Harry Eckstein, "Case studies and theory in political science," in *Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 7*, eds. Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1975), 79-138.

[44] For example, Cha finds that the rationale on the part of the United States in the creation of the hub and spokes was to constrain its anticommunist allies in Northeast Asia from engaging in aggressive military behaviors against its adversaries. Temerson similarly argues that the alliance relationship between the US and Japan during the Cold War worked as an institutional mechanism via which the superpower exercised a decisive influence over the reform of Japan's domestic political institutions to transform the defeated wartime power into a status quo regional power. See Cha, "Powerplay."; Temerson, *Double Containment and the Origins of the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance*.

regional state's negative assessment of security has the potential to cause it to pursue military behaviors that are against the strategic interests of its patron.

The case study focuses on the Nixon Administration's retrenchment as the primary factor influencing each of the regional states' security assessments. There are two points to note regarding how the case study is designed to control for alternative factors that have the potential to affect each of the regional states' security assessments. First, the case selection helps to control for alternative factors at the level of the international system, such as the distribution of power among great powers, offense-defense balance, and international economic pressure, which may affect the regional states' security assessment.[45] Second, each of the states was unable to find another state to act as an ally in response to the Nixon administration's retrenchment. In this respect, the case study controls for the possibility that a superpower's retrenchment may not lead its allies to work on domestic drives for military preparedness when they have alternative sources of allied support.

The case selection also helps to control for the neoclassical realist argument that a regional state's relationship with domestic society should affect its willingness to increase the societal contribution toward an autonomous defense capability. There are two points to note. First, South Korea and Taiwan enjoyed not only high levels of autonomy from domestic society but also high levels of capability to penetrate and mobilize their domestic societies in conducting the states' national policies. In addition, because anti-

---

[45] Snyder and Taliaferro characterize these factors as structural modifiers that may increase or decrease the likelihood of conflict. See Glenn H. Snyder, "Process Variables in Neorealist Theory," *Security Studies* 5, no. 3 (1996): 168-71; Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "Security Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited," *International Security* 25, no. 3 (2000/01): 136-41.

statist ideology was not widely embedded in the domestic societies of these two states, the leadership of the two states did not witness substantial domestic resistance to the state's initiative to launch domestic drives toward an autonomous defense posture.[46] In contrast, Japan's security policy is known to have been substantially constrained by anti-militarist norms embedded in domestic society. But the Japanese leadership did not witness any substantial domestic oppositional movements regarding the state's security policy during the 1970s.[47] Second, none of the three states are constrained by class conflicts. The establishment of large-scale rearmament programs is socially divisive in nature, and thus, a state whose society is divided by class interests is likely to be faced with domestic resistance when introducing mass-scale programs for the establishment of an indigenous military capability.[48] The absence of class conflicts thus suggests another explanation for the absence of domestic resistance toward each of the regional states' security-promoting domestic campaigns.

---

[46] Regarding the state-society relationship of South Korea during the 1970s, see Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra F. Vogel, *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011). As for the state-society relationship in Taiwan, see Shelley Rigger, *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Hung-mao Tien, "Social Change and Political Development in Taiwan," in *Taiwan in a Time of Transition*, eds. Harvey Feldman, and Ilpyong J. Kim (New York: Paragon House, 1988), 1-37; Edwin A. Winckler, "Institutionalization and Participation on Taiwan: From Hard to Soft Authoritarianism?" *The China Quarterly* 99 (September 1984): 481-99.

[47] Izumikawa finds Japan's security policy during the 1970s was a deviant case for the antimilitarist model in the sense that Japan's security policy during this period was not constrained by domestic resistance. See Yasuhiro Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan's Security Policy," *International Security* 35, no. 2 (2010): 123-60.

[48] Kevin Narizny, "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 2 (2003): 203-20.

1.5.3. Measurement of Variables

1.5.3.1. A Regional State's Security Assessment

The case study should make inference of security assessment of each regional state's leadership. The primary method of inference is qualitative analysis of the written and spoken statements of each state's leadership regarding its adversary's military threats and its patron's reliability. Because of the limited availability of these primary source data, the case study also introduces two alternatives methods. First, it refers to primary source documents and secondary source literature that contain information on each state leadership's perception of security. Second, the case study refers to the development of security environment each regional state directly faced. This provides circumstantial evidence to make inference of each state's assessment of security.

The case study uses documents from the following primary data sources. First, the U.S. Government Printing Office published two volumes of documents that contain information about how the leadership of South Korea and Japan assessed the state's security in response to the Nixon administration's strategic posture in Northeast Asia.[49] Second, the U.S. Government Printing Office also provides two published volumes of documents that contain information about how the leadership of Taiwan assessed the

---

[49] One is *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1969–1976, Volume XIX, Part 1, Korea, 1969–1972, eds. Daniel J. Lawler and Erin R. Mahan (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 2010). This study refers to the e-book version of this volume, which is available at https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.history.state.gov/frus/frus1969-76v19p1/pdf/frus1969-76v19p1.pdf. This will be abbreviated as FRUS Korea 1969-1972. The other is *Investigation of Korean-American Relations: Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Committee on International Relations* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1978). This will be abbreviated as Investigation of Korean-American Relations hereinafter.

state's security in response to the US retrenchment in Northeast Asia.[50] Third, the *National Security Archive*, located at George Washington University, provides a digital compilation of declassified records on the US-Japan alliance from 1960 through 1976.[51] From this compilation, the case study obtained primary source documents that contain information about how the Japanese leadership assessed the state's security under the Nixon administration's retrenchment. Fourth, the *National Security Archive*, provides a digital compilation of declassified records on the US-China relations from 1960 through 1998. From this compilation, the case study obtained documents that contain information about how the ROC leadership's security assessment.[52] Fifth, under the sponsorship of the National Security Archive, the U.S.-Japan Project conducted interviews with former Japanese officials who were closely involved with the formulation of Japan's security policy since 1960.[53] The case study of Japan obtained data from this primary source.

In the case of Japan, the case study considers the fact that the security policy during the 1970s was formulated under the initiative of the Defense Agency of Japan (JDA). In this respect, the case study focuses on how the JDA policymakers assessed the state's

---

[50] *Foreign Relations of the United States,* 1969–1976, Volume XVII, China, 1969–1972, eds. Steven E. Phillips and Edward C. Keefer (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2006); *Foreign Relations of the United States 1969–1976*, Volume XVIII, China, 1973–1976, eds. eds. David P. Nickles and Edward C. Keefer (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2007). The present study refers to the e-book version of the two volumes. The e-book version of the former volume is available at https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.history.state.gov/frus/frus1969-76v17/pdf/frus1969-76v17.pdf. This will be abbreviated as FRUS China 1969-1972. The e-book version of the latter is available at https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.history.state.gov/frus/frus1969-76v18/pdf/frus1969-76v18.pdf. This will be abbreviated FRUS China 1973-1976 hereinafter.

[51] This digital compilation will be abbreviated as Japan and the United States 1960-1976 hereinafter. Regarding the general information on the declassified records, see http://proquest.libguides.com/dnsa/japan1960.

[52] This digital compilation will be abbreviated as China and the United States 1960-1998 hereinafter. Regarding the general information on the declassified records, see http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nsa/publications/china-us/.

[53] The interviews are available at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/japan/ohpage.htm.

security in response to the US retrenchment. In comparison, the case study of the other two states measures security assessment of the state's top political leaders: the ROK president Park Chung Hee and his core policymakers in the case of South Korea, and the ROC Premier Chiang Ching-kuo and his core policymakers in the case of Taiwan. In the case of the two states, it was relatively easy to form a consensus among policymaking leaders because the two states' structure of policymaking process was highly centralized. The formation of a consensus allowed them to act as a realist version of a unitary actor under the state's security initiative.[54]

According to the theory of this research, a regional state's security concern can be discussed as a continuous variable. First, at one end of the spectrum, there is a regional state that believes that its adversary will make use of the superpower's retrenchment for its revisionist purposes and, at the same time, suspects that the superpower will not provide security assistance in times of needs. The level of such a state's security concern should be substantially high. Second, at the opposite end, there is another regional state that is confident in the patron's commitment and, at the same time, is confident that its adversary will not introduce revisionist behaviors. The level of such a state's security concern should be substantially low.

---

[54] With respect to how the policymaking elites' consensus affects the state's response to the international security environment, Skocpol suggests the following: "it seems that organizationally coherent collectivities of state officials, especially collectivities of career officials relatively insulated from ties to currently dominant socioeconomic interests, are likely to launch distinctive new state strategies in times of crisis. Likewise, collectivities of officials may elaborate already established public policies in distinctive ways, acting relatively continuously over long stretches of time." See Theda Skocpol, "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research," in *Bringing the State Back In*, eds. Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 9.

In measuring the independent variable, the case study focuses on how each regional state's leadership assessed the state's security in response to the Nixon administration's strategic posture in East Asia. But measuring the dependent variables makes it necessary for the case study to examine each regional state's security-seeking behaviors during the whole period of the 1970s. This helps to fully documents how each leadership's assessment of security affected the formulation of the security-promoting domestic drives and how each regional state's security assessment affected its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against the US strategic interests. The extension of timespan can be also justified by the fact that the Nixon administration's strategic posture in East Asia was sustained until the Carter administration.

1.5.3.2. A Regional State's Military Behaviors against the Strategic Interests of Its Patron

The case study examines the compatibility between each of the regional states' military behaviors and the US's strategic interests in Northeast Asia. For example, the US's key strategic interest in Northeast Asia was to establish a peaceful status quo in this region. Thus, a regional state's military policy that was incompatible with the superpower state's desire to establish a peaceful status-quo in Northeast Asia could be described as a military behavior that would jeopardize the US's strategic interests in this region.

A regional state's willingness to engage in military behaviors against the strategic interests of its patron can be discussed as a continuous variable. To operationally measure this variable, the case study documents the level of internal cohesion within the leadership of the three states when pursuing such adventurous behaviors. The more the

cohesive leadership of a state, the more it is committed to the pursuit of a military policy against the patron's strategic interests.

In addition, the case study examines how each of the regional states responded to the US's coercive efforts to reverse the military behaviors against its strategic interests. When a regional state is strongly committed to the pursuit of the military behaviors, it is unlikely to abandon them, even in the face of the patron's coercive efforts. In contrast, a superpower will find it relatively easy to make its junior ally abandon the objectionable behaviors when the junior ally is modestly committed to the pursuit of these behaviors. Finally, a regional state will voluntarily abandon the pursuit of military behaviors against the strategic interests of its patron, even without the presence of the patron's coercive efforts, when it is weakly committed to the pursuit of the behaviors.

1.5.3.3. A Regional State's Security-Enhancing Domestic Drives

The measurement of a regional security-promoting domestic drives begins with discussing the state leadership's initiatives to direct domestic resources toward the establishment of an autonomous defense capability because it is the essential strategy to increase the contribution of domestic society to defense. Because the state is "institutionally separated from organized production," political leaders should introduce centralized control over the economic activity of domestic society to direct national

resources toward achieving self-sufficiency in the establishment of an autonomous defense posture.[55]

This domestic drive takes two forms: mobilization and extraction. Mobilization refers to the state's intervention in the domestic economy to produce the required materials for the establishment of indigenous military capabilities, whereas extraction refers to the direct conversion of societal wealth into military power through taxation, requisition, and expropriation.[56] When faced with immediate external threats, political leaders are likely to introduce extraction because it enables them to gain rapid access to domestic resources. In contrast, mobilization is a state's relatively long-term strategy to establish the industrial and technological basis of the state's military capabilities.[57]

One may argue that examination of a change in defense spending as a share of national income is a straightforward way of measuring a regional state's willingness to direct national resources toward the establishment of an autonomous defense posture. In this respect, the case study examines each state's defense spending. However, there are two points that should be addressed in using this quantitative indicator. First, one often finds it difficult to exclude all appropriations of a non-military character when using an

---

[55] Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 538.

[56] In this respect, mobilization is "the creation of wealth and an investment in power," whereas extraction is "the creation of power and the consumption of wealth" for security purposes. See Michael Mastanduno, David A. Lake and John G, Ikenberry, "Toward a Realist Theory of State Action," *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1989): 463. Barnett defines mobilization as the state's production policy for military build-ups, while he defines extraction as the state's financial policy for arms-ups. See Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 538-40. Another way to discuss the difference between mobilization and extraction is via the ways in which the two methods affect the state's short-term military security and long-term economic capacity, both of which are the essential components of the state's survival. From this viewpoint, extraction is the strategy adopted to prioritize the state's military security over economic capacity, whereas mobilization is a strategy adopted to maintain a balance between short-term and long-term security. Regarding this difference, see Stephen G. Brooks, "Dueling Realisms," *International Organization* 51, no. 3 (1997): 450-53.

[57] Mastanduno, Lake, and Ikenberry, "Toward a Realist Theory of State Action," 462-63.

existing database for the state's military expenditure. Secondly, a change in military expenditures is also determined by a state's other security needs. Thus, the quantitative indicator may not reflect the precise level of a regional state's security concern in the face of the patron's retrenchment.[58]

A regional state's security concern makes the state's leadership select policy instruments intended to increase the domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. In doing so, political leaders will invariably begin by restricting the selection of policy instrument to those that are presently contained in its central apparatus in order to avoid domestic resistance.[59] As the security concern increases, a regional state must introduce large-scale campaigns to direct national resources toward the establishment of an autonomous defense capability.[60] This should decrease the amount of national resources that will be directed toward programs other than national defense. In addition, there may be large-scale institutional and societal costs involved in sustaining the state's security-promoting domestic drives.[61] The large-scale campaigns can thus generate resistance from affected societal groups.[62]

The leadership of a state must overcome the societal constraints when introducing mass-scale domestic campaigns. This requires the leadership to place domestic drives on

---

[58] In this respect, Narizny argues that "defense burden indicators may be distorted by the operational costs of lesser conflicts that run concurrent with or immediately prior to the primary increase in threat." Narizny, "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither," 207.

[59] Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 541.

[60] The introduction of large-scale domestic drives may include the transformation of the domestic economic structure and even the private control of production. See Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 539; Narizny, "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither," 205.

[61] As Resende-Santos points out, "the mobilization and mustering of human and material resources will usually entail reform and restructuring in the rest of the state apparatus, the economy, and society." See Resende-Santos, *Neorealism, States, and the Modern Mass Army*. 18-9.

[62] Narizny, "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither."

solid societal ground.[63] For example, it may attempt to increase the institutional capacity to penetrate domestic society to secure societal support.[64] But this comes at the cost of establishing an expansive administrative apparatus to penetrate into domestic society.[65] The present study examines whether each regional states attempted to establish a societal basis of national military preparedness when they needed to substantially increase the contribution of domestic society toward an autonomous defense posture.

The inevitable tension between state and society suggests that the establishment of an autonomous defense posture is very much a collective undertaking, carrying considerable political costs and risks domestically.[66] As such, political leaders should make efforts to increase elite-mass linkage when launching massive-scale security-promoting domestic drives.[67] This requires the leadership of a state to justify the drives to direct national resources toward an autonomous defense capability. Thus the case study examines the "ideological mobilization" as a part of the security-enhancing domestic drives.[68]

Existing scholarship discusses three strategies with which the leadership of a state attempts to mobilize domestic support. First, political leaders deliberately inculcate state-

---

[63] As Barnett points out, "the state and its political institutions must have a strong societal basis in order to garner societal compliance with its policies." See Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 540.
[64] In this respect, Barnett argues that the state's institutional capacity to penetrate domestic society should be the most important factor to affect the state's ability to mobilize domestic financial resources for the state's military preparedness. See Barnett, "High Politics is Low Politics," 538.
[65] Resende-Santos, *Neorealism, States, and the Modern Mass Army*.
[66] Randall Schweller, "Neoclassical Realism and State Mobilization, Expansionist Ideology in the Age of Mass Politics." in *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 227-50.
[67] Randall L. Schweller, "Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing," *International Security* 29, no. 2 (2004): 173-74.
[68] Kohli points out that political leaders often introduce such "ideological mobilization" to gain societal support for the state's developmental strategy. See Atul Kohli, *State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 10.

sponsored nationalism because it tends to increase the cohesion of domestic society and the mass public's propensity to identify with the state. This in turn facilitates the state's efforts to direct national human and material resources toward military build-ups.[69] In contrast, fragmented states find it difficult to direct domestic resources under the initiative of national security.[70] Second, the leadership of a state introduces ideology as a way of mobilizing the mass public's support.[71] However, an ideology may thwart the initiative of the state's leadership, depending on its contents.[72] Third, political leaders manipulate international conflicts to justify costly domestic campaigns to establish national military preparedness.[73]

---

[69] Jeffrey W. Taliaferro "State Building for Future Wars: Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State." *Security Studies* 15, no. 3 (2006): 491. Posen's case study of the security competition between France and Prussia/Germany during the period from the Seven Years War (1756-63) to the eve of the First World War shows that these European great powers inculcated nationalism to mobilize the spirit of self-sacrifice among millions of soldiers, which in turn increased the intensity of warfare between the rivals. France, for example, deliberately inculcated nationalism through propaganda campaigns, political indoctrination, and the medium of compulsory primary education, to generate public support for the mass conscription during the French Revolutionary Wars. See Barry R Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993): 80-124.

[70] Schweller, *Unanswered Threats*, 51-4.

[71] Wohlforth investigates how the thesis of "détente through strength," which suggests that "the more powerful a country is, the more inducement it can offer for an alliance and the more resources it can contribute, so the better able it is to play the balance-of-power game," helped the Soviet Union to increase its military power. See William C. Wohlforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 51-4. As Taliaferro points out, the thesis of the Soviet regime, articulated by Joseph Stalin and the political leaders of the Soviet regime in the 1930s, justified the regime's drive to extract national resources for "the crash industrialization programs in the 1930s" and the state's military build-ups during the period after Second World War. See Taliaferro, "State Building for Future Wars," 493.

[72] Friedberg finds that American anti-statist ideology, consisting of a fear of power concentrated in the hands of the central government, and beliefs in economic liberalism, narrowed the range of policy options for the state's domestic mobilization drives to deal with the threats posed by the Soviet Union. This in turn led to the ineffective balancing of United States against the Soviet Union during the early part of the Cold War. See Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State*, 21-3.

[73] Thomas J. Christensen, *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).

The case study discusses a regional state's willingness to launch security-promoting domestic strategies as a continuous variable. Accordingly, at one end of the spectrum lies a state that restricts policy options to those that are presently available in its central apparatus. This state is unlikely to introduce any substantial domestic drives. In contrast, at the other end of the spectrum, there lies another state that attempts to introduce maximal-scale security-promoting domestic drives to establish an autonomous defense posture. Such a state introduces substantial domestic drives to direct national resources toward the establishment of an autonomous defense capability. Political leaders of this state also try to increase the institutional capacity to penetrate domestic society to place the domestic drives on solid societal ground. In addition, the leadership of this state is likely to mobilize mass public support for the state's security initiatives.

1.6. Chapter Conclusion

This chapter suggested that the present research was planned to explore how a regional state could increase its security in response to its patron's strategic retrenchment. What made this author interested in this research topic was an empirical puzzle that is found in the behaviors of the US allies in Northeast Asia, namely, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, during the time of the superpower's strategic retrenchment in the 1970s. Why did they develop different behaviors rather than responding to the superpower's retrenchment in a uniform fashion? To solve this empirical puzzle, I introduced a theory of a regional state's security-seeking behaviors during the time of its patron's retrenchment, which is composed of three sections: operationalization of a regional state's security concerns during the time of its patron's retrenchment, a theory of a regional ally's security-seeking domestic drives, and a theory of a regional state's pursuit of a military policy against its patron's strategic interests.

First, the theory operationally defined a regional ally's assessment of security under the patron's retrenchment. Rather than simply considering the state's security concern as the fear of abandonment, the theory treated it as a combination of a regional state's perception of patron reliability and its perception of military threats posed by the adversary. This study will introduce three methods to infer each regional state's security assessment. The primary method of inference will be qualitative analysis of the written and spoken statements of each state's leadership regarding its adversary's military threats and its patron's reliability. In addition, each case study will refer to primary source documents and secondary source literature that contain information on each state

leadership's perception of security in response to the Nixon administration's retrenchment. The case study will also refer to the development of the security environment each regional state directly faced, because this method provides circumstantial evidence to make inference of each state's assessment of security.

Second, I argued that a regional state's security concern will lead it to introduce domestic drives to promote societal contribution to its autonomous defense posture. It is theorized that there is co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of its efforts to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. To measure the state's security-promoting domestic drives, the case study will examine a change in defense spending as a share of national income because this is a straightforward way to measure the scope of a state's domestic drives to increase the societal contribution to an autonomous defense posture. But this study also acknowledges that this quantitative indicator may not reflect the precise level of a regional state's security concern under the patron's retrenchment. In this respect, the present study will use other qualitative indicators to measure the security-seeking behaviors. Each case study will examine whether there was the state leadership's initiative to direct domestic resources toward autonomous defense capability. It will also examine whether each leadership tried to mobilize domestic support under the initiative of national security.

Third, the present study theorized that a regional state's pursuit of military policies against its patron's strategic interests is a function of its security assessment during the security provider's retrenchment. According to the theory, it is hypothesized that there is co-variation between the level of a regional state's negative assessment of security and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy that jeopardizes the

strategic interests of its security provider. Each case study will use the following three qualitative indicators to measure the level of each regional state's commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron. First, it will measure the compatibility between each of the regional states' military behaviors and the US's strategic interests in Northeast Asia. Second, the case study will examine the level of internal cohesion within the leadership of the regional states when pursuing a military policy against the US strategic interests. Third, it will examine how each of the regional states responded to the US's coercive efforts to reverse the military behaviors against its strategic interests.

CHAPTER 2. CASE STUDY OF JAPAN

2.1. Japan's Perception of Security

2.1.1. Japan's Security Assessment in Response to the Nixon Doctrine

During the early stage of the Nixon presidency, the most important issue between the US and Japan was the reversion of Okinawa, which had been occupied by the US since the end of the Second World War. The Japanese voices to demand the return of Okinawa grew louder with the escalation of the Vietnam War. A growing fear of entrapment contributed to the movement to oppose the US's use of military bases in Okinawa for its conventional military operations during the Vietnam War. The opposition to the Vietnam War also implied that the automatic renewal of the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty would not be guaranteed.[1] It was in this domestic context that Prime Minister Sato pledged to reclaim Japanese sovereignty over Okinawa.

The return of Okinawa was also important issue for the Nixon Administration because it needed to preserve the effectiveness of the American military bases in Okinawa, which was critical to maintaining the US deterrence capability in East Asia. It revealed the desire to revert the administrative rights over Okinawa to Japan under

---

[1] Yashiro Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan's Security Policy," *International Security* 35, no. 2 (2010): 141.

favorable terms so as to retain base functions on Okinawa. Crucial negotiations surrounding the issue of the return of Okinawa lasted from June 1969 to June 1971, when the two allies signed the negotiated agreement.[2]

The U.S.-Japan negotiations suggest two points that help us to discuss the Japanese response to the Nixon Administration's strategic posture in East Asia. First, the negotiation process reconfirmed the US security commitment to the regional allies in East Asia. The two allies reached an agreement regarding the US use of the military bases in Okinawa for regional contingencies in the Korean Peninsula and Taiwan Strait, as well as for the continuation of the US's conventional military operations for the Vietnam War.[3] Japan referred to this agreement in evaluating the superpower's security commitment. Secondly, Japan was committed to honoring the strategic interests of the United States in East Asia to secure the reversion of Okinawa under favorable terms. The Sato Administration concluded that Japan should be ready to assume a larger regional role as a way of supporting the patron's strategic posture in Asia. Considering this deferential attitude, Japan was shocked by the Nixon administration's unilateral announcement of the Nixon Doctrine and of the normalization of relations with the PRC, which would have the potential to negatively affect its security.

Nixon's image in Japan was "an inflexible and uncompromising anti-Communist ideologue" whose Cold War fundamentalism would not change.[4] However, his message

---

[2] Yukinori Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China, 1969–1972," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 20, no. 3 (2009): 497.
[3] Victor D. Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism: The United States-Korea-Japan Security Triangle* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 51; Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 497.
[4] John Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar America Alliance System* (London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone Press, 1988), 241-42.

about the policy of disengagement in Asia led the Japanese to be ambiguous regarding the patron's resolve to defend Japan.[5] There was also concern regarding the longer-term implications of the Nixon Administration's vision to extend Japan's place far beyond the role of financially supporting US military activities in East Asia. This concern led to the apprehension that the ultimate objective of the Nixon doctrine would be a recasting of the security relationship between Japan and the United States.[6]

The Nixon administration unilaterally proposed a force rationalization program, which reduced total US troop levels to approximately half of their strength in 1960.[7] This program induced the Japanese fear of US military disengagement from Japan.[8] This fear, to some extent, is also related with the issue of how the reduction of US forces would compromise the operational defense capabilities of the superpower's allies in Northeast Asia.[9] However, the anxieties centered on the abrupt and non-consultative manner in which the Nixon Administration had proceeded.[10] In other words, the anxiety over the patron's military retrenchment was rooted in the erosion of the basis of trust the Japanese deemed so important to the security relationship between Japan and the United States.

The anxiety over the patron's military retrenchment made the Japanese leadership publicly express the fear of abandonment in spite of domestic political incentives that

---

[5] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 69.
[6] Ibid., 70.
[7] Ibid., 71.
[8] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 145.
[9] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 73.
[10] Cha documents the Japanese concerns regarding the way in which the United States applied the Nixon Doctrine to Japan. For example, Armin Meyer, the US ambassador to Japan sent a cable to Washington in August 1970 that urgently advised the Department of State of Japanese concerns regarding the Nixon Administration's unilateralism. Nakasone Yasuhiro, Director General of Japan's Defense Agency, criticized the Nixon administration for undertaking the U.S. withdrawals from Japan drastically and "in all out fashion without coordination" with Japan. See Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 71.

might have prevented it from doing so.[11] First, the Sato administration was not supposed to publicly voice anxiety over the patron's retrenchment because it would create public suspicion that the state's leadership would attempt to justify the presence of nuclear weapons within the territory of Japan.[12] Second, the impending renewal of the US-Japan mutual security treaty in 1970 weighed against the overt expression of concern regarding US abandonment. Fervent expressions of the abandonment fear would make the Japanese public focus on the issues regarding the state's defense buildup, which would in turn ignite antimilitarist forces in Japan. This situation would not be conducive to easing the automatic renewal of the security treaty. However, the Japanese leadership overtly expressed concern regarding the patron's abandonment, instead of tempering the expression of this fear as a way to preempt domestic antimilitarist forces.

---

[11] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 71-2.

[12] A high priority issue during the negotiations over the return of Okinawa was whether the nuclear weapons deployed by the US forces would remain on the island following the reversion. The Japanese public was particularly concerned about the reintroduction of nuclear weapons on the island because it would make Japan a potential target of nuclear attack by the Soviet Union or Communist China. The public thus vehemently opposed the redeployment of nuclear weapons on Okinawa. Regarding the concern expressed by the Japanese public, see Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 141-42.

2.1.2. The Nixon Shock and Japan's Assessment of the US Reliability

Nixon initially adopted a strategy of confrontation with the People's Republic of China because of his Cold War fundamentalism. His commitment to anti-Communist ideology also led to the Nixon Administration's emphasis of the threat posed by China until it was confident in the adversary's intentions to accommodate the US.[13] Then it suddenly shifted its strategy by announcing the president's visit to China to launch a diplomatic initiative to normalize relations, while assuring Japan that it would not contemplate any basic change in its policy toward the PRC.[14] This unilateral approach reflected the ideas of Kissinger and his NSC staff, who were highly concerned that any prior consultation with Japan would undermine the Nixon Administration's diplomatic initiative toward China.[15]

The Sato administration followed the US's hardline posture because it believed that a close alliance with the United States would lead the patron to accommodate Japan's national interests.[16] Sato overly emphasized the Chinese threats, even though his threat perception of the communist China was relatively more modest. This modest level of threat perception suggests that there was little fear of the Chinese threat in Japan because of the recognition that the economic and technological gap between the two countries

---

[13] Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 242.
[14] Just a week before the announcement of Nixon's visit to the PRC, Defense Secretary Melvin Laid assured Sato that the Nixon Administration was not contemplating any basic change in its policy toward China. Regarding the US assurance, see Michael Schaller, *Altered States: The United States and Japan since the Occupation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 228.
[15] Komine, ″The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 498.
[16] Go Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety: Détente and the Sino-American-Japanese Triangle* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 53.; Schaller, *Altered State*, 229.

was so great and would continue to grow for the foreseeable future.[17] Nonetheless, he emphasized the Chinese threats because he wanted to ensure that Japan would agree with the Nixon Administration's hardline attitudes toward communist China.[18] The emphasis of the Chinese threat also reflected the ideological hostility toward the adversary as a revolutionary power.[19]

Thus the sudden shift in the US policy toward China led to the erosion of trust in the patron's reliability. Japan was particularly concerned about how its interests would be discussed during negotiations between the United States and China.[20] Because of the suspicion that Beijing's fundamental objective would be to "split Japan off from the U.S." and "neutralize" it, Japan was particularly concerned whether the PRC leadership would attempt to use the superpower's new China policy to drive a wedge between Japan and the United States.[21]

The unilateral manner of the Nixon administration made Japan suspect a lack of sympathy on the part of the patron about Japan's predicament.[22] As Reischauer put it, "Japanese public … … responds more strongly to the style and mood of our relationship

---

[17] Airgram from US Department of State to US Embassy in Tokyo, "U.S.-Japan Consultations on Communist China," 11 April 1969, Japan and the United States 1960-1976. In his interview for the U.S.-Japan Project, Seiki Nishihiro, a former vice minister of JDA, similarly concluded that China did not become a direct threat to Japan, due to the analysis that it did not have enough naval capability. This interview is available at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/japan/nishihiroohinterview.htm.

[18] Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety*, 22-5.

[19] Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 232-33.

[20] Airgram from US Embassy in Tokyo to US Department of State, "Japanese Foreign Ministry Analysis of President Nixon's Visit to China and the U.S.-China Joint Communique," 7 April 1972, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

[21] Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 500. This suspicion also led to the accusation that Beijing was using the fear of Japanese militarism to isolate Japan and drive a wedge between the allies of the United States. Regarding the Japanese fear, see Schaller, *Altered State*, 231.

[22] Roger Buckley, *US-Japan Alliance Diplomacy 1945-1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 127.

than to its actual content … … Japanese feel that by speaking so frankly (harshly they might say), and acting so unexpectedly, we have shown ourselves to be unfriendly and unreliable."[23] The Japanese assessment was that the patron's commitment would no longer be guaranteed because it might change depending on the superpower's global tactics and strategy.[24] Consequently, Japanese faith in the reliability of the security patron was shattered.[25] As Alexis Johnson assessed, "[after] this 'Nixon shokku [shock]' as the Japanese called it, there has never again been the same trust and confidence between our two governments"[26]

The Nixon Administration's new China policy also raised the issue of whether the superpower would maintain its security commitment to Taiwan. Japan suspected that the real intent of the Nixon Administration was to admit the communist China into the United Nations instead of Taiwan. This suspicion made Japan criticize the patron for "its heartless disregard" for its obligations to its allies.[27] To stress the patron's obligation, the Japan Government referred to the 1969 Joint Communique, which emphasized the importance of the security of Taiwan in the security of Japan.[28] Japan's concern also centered on the 1972 communique between the US and the PRC, which for the first time,

---

[23] This remark was cited from Reischauer's letter, which was sent to the president Nixon. The letter is dated on October 28, 1971. Reischauer served as the US Ambassador to Japan under the Johnson administration. I obtained this letter from the search engine of the Declassified Documents Reference System, which is available at http://gdc.gale.com/products/declassified-documents-reference-system/ (accessed June 15, 2012).

[24] Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety*, 53-4.

[25] Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 295.

[26] Komine, ″The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 500.

[27] Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety*, 50.

[28] Sung-chull Kim, "Sino-Japanese Normalization and Japan's Korean Policy, 1972-75." in *The Koreas between China and Japan*, eds. Teo Victor, and Geun Lee (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 46.

included the statement on the withdrawal of US forces from Taiwan.[29] The leadership of Japan suspected that the communique committed the United States to the ultimate removal of her forces from Taiwan.[30]

Japan's concern, however, was not a top policy issue to deal with for Kissinger and his NSC Staff, who took the initiative in the foreign policymaking process during the Nixon Presidency.[31] In contrast, the Department of State was concerned with how the Nixon Administration's unilateral manner would affect the alliance between the United States and Japan.[32] Thus it argued that the Nixon Administration should calm Japan's increasing anxiety over the possible softening toward communist China.[33] This led to the suggestion that the US should demonstrate its willingness to maintain its commitment to the security of Japan via "a more realistic and forthcoming discussion of US policies and plans affecting the security of Japan."[34] However, Kissinger and his NSC staff minimized the involvement of the State Department in the process of the rapprochement with the PRC.[35]

---

[29] Ushida, Japan's Ambassador to the United States, expressed the Japanese concern to Kissinger. The response on the part of Kissinger was that the Nixon Administration would link the withdrawal of US forces to a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question and to a reduction of tension in the area. "Memorandum of Conversation between Kissinger and Ushida," 6 March 1972. Declassified Documents Reference System.

[30] Airgram from US Embassy in Tokyo to US Department of State, "Japanese Foreign Ministry Analysis of President Nixon's Visit to China and the U.S.-China Joint Communique," 7 April 1972. Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

[31] Komine, ″The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China."

[32] U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of the State, complained that Kissinger and Nixon shoved their most important ally in Asia onto the back burner. See Schaller, *Altered State*, 228.

[33] It suggested that the Nixon Administration "should be careful not to cross over the line that would cause the Japanese to have such doubts about our deterrent capabilities and intentions with respect to Japan and the rest of the area." See FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 185.

[34] US Department of State, "Policy Analysis Resource Allocation Study," 6 June 1972, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

[35] Komine, ″The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 498.

2.1.3. The Amelioration of Japan's Security Concern

The anxiety over the superpower's unilateral manner, however, did not foster a rampant security concern. One factor to explain this is Japan's security assessment in response to the US military withdrawal from Vietnam. The Japanese logistical support for the US military operations in Vietnam, coupled with the escalation of the Vietnam War, led to concerns about the risk of being entrapped in the Vietnam War.[36] This anxiety was manifested in Japan's vehement rejection of any clear mention of a security link between Japan and Vietnam in the Nixon-Sato joint communique in 1969, which was in contrast to the acceptance of a clear security link between Japan and South Korea.[37] The heightened fear of entrapment was also reflected in public opinion during the 1960s; the majority of the Japanese public was concerned about the risk of Japan being entrapped in the Vietnam War.[38] The US posture of military retrenchment in Vietnam decreased the potential for Japan's entanglement in the Vietnam War, because of which the Japanese anxiety regarding the security environment was mitigated.[39] Thus the Nixon Administration's Vietnamization program did not make Japan substantially concerned about the patron's reliability, which contrasted with the reaction to the US force reduction programs in Japan and South Korea.

---

[36] The logistic support for the US forces in Vietnam included ammunition depots and fuel in Okinawa for B-52 bombing runs originating in Guam, hospitals, and repair facilities. Such operations fell under the terms of the Mutual Security Treaty between the United States and Japan. Regarding the military support, see Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 70. However, they raised concerns that the escalation of the Vietnam War would cause Japan to become further entrapped in a large US military strategy in the Vietnam War. Regarding the Japanese concern, see Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 141-42.

[37] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 70.

[38] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 140.

[39] Ibid., 148.

Japan's security concerns were ameliorated by the development of détente in the Korean peninsula.[40] The inter-Korean communique in 1972 made the Japanese government confident that a workable détente between the two Koreas would be established.[41] The Japanese assessment was similar to the expectation of the U.S. Department of State indicating that the two Koreas would introduce a step-by-step approach to perpetual peace in the Korean peninsula.[42] The positive assessment of the Korean thaw suggests that the belligerence of Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK or aka North Korea) became less of a critical factor in Japan's assessment of threats in Northeast Asia.[43]

Japan's anxiety over the patron's reliability was also mitigated by the Nixon Administration's assurances that Washington would maintain its commitment to Korea. The US forces reduction programs were indeed designed to implement further reduction of the US military presence in Korea.[44] Furthermore, the Nixon Administration regarded the establishment of détente in Northeast Asia as a precondition to implementing further reductions of US forces.[45] The development of détente, however, made the US decide to

---

[40] Regarding the Japanese sensitivity to the security situation of the Korean peninsula, see Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 51.

[41] Ibid., 106.

[42] Jung-en Woo, *Race to the Swift: State and Finance in Korean Industrialization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 116.

[43] In this respect, the Japanese threat assessment of the Korean peninsula was similar to the U.S. estimate that "the danger of major hostilities [between the two Koreas] is less now than at any time since the 1953 Armistice." See FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 437.

[44] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 149.

[45] The United States and China discussed the issue of the US military presence in Korea during the negotiations for the normalization of relations between them. The PRC's concern about the remilitarization of Japan led it to propose that the US gradually withdraw its forces from South Korea. Kissinger responded to the PRC's request as follows: "if the relationships between our countries develop as they might, after the Indochina war ends and the ROK troops return to Korea, I would think it quite conceivable that before the end of the next term of President Nixon, most, if not all, American troops will be withdrawn from Korea" See FRUS China 1969-1972, 390.

continue the presence of its forces in South Korea because it came to acknowledge that the US military presence in Korea would be necessary to aid in the development of détente in the Korean peninsula.[46] This acknowledgement led to the Nixon Administration's numerous assurances to Japan that the US would continue to honor its commitment to Korea, which in turn shored up Japanese confidence in its patron's commitment to Korea.[47]

Japan's threat perception was mollified to a substantial degree as it came to regard the Sino-American rapprochement as a driving force in establishing stability in Northeast Asia. The summit between the Unites States and the PRC in February 1972, which affirmed that neither side had any territorial ambitions, led to the Japanese assessment that communist China would search for stability in Northeast Asia by normalizing its relations with the United States.[48]

More important to the mollification of Japan's security concerns was the agreement between the leadership of the United States and the PRC about the role of the US military presence in Japan in the stability in Northeast Asia. Throughout the Sino-American

---

[46] The White House. "Memorandum for Mr. Henry Kissinger," 12 July 1972. Subject Numeric Files, RG 59, National Archives. China also came to acknowledge the necessity of the presence of US forces in Korea for the sake of maintaining the status quo in Northeast Asia. Regarding this point, see US Department of State. "Secretary Kissinger's Discussion with President Park", 16 November 1973. Subject Numeric Files, RG 59, National Archives.

[47] For example, Secretary of State William P. Rodgers gave a policy statement in 1973 in which he asserted that the United States would continue to honor its security commitment to Korea because the US military presence there had facilitated the development of détente on the Korean peninsula. This assurance made the Defense Agency of Japan conclude that there was very little possibility of additional withdrawals of US forces from Korea. The Foreign Ministry of Japan similarly stated that the Nixon Administration's numerous assurances had shored up confidence that the US military commitment to Korea would not be lessened in the immediate future. Regarding the Japanese assessment of the US commitment to Korea, see Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 107.

[48] US Department of State, "Japanese Defense Alternatives," 3 August 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

negotiation process, the Nixon Administration emphasized the danger of the withdrawal of US forces from East Asia to justify the US-Japan Security Treaty.[49] The leadership of China, in response, emphasized the security treaty between the United States and Japan as a brake on Japan's military expansion because it was concerned that the superpower's military retrenchment in Northeast Asia would lead to the reemergence of Japanese militarism.[50] The leaderships of the two states thus came to an agreement that US tutelage would safely prevent the resurrection of Japanese military expansion.[51]

Japan's advancement of relations toward China was another key factor contributing to the amelioration of Japan's security concerns. Japan's new approach toward China began with Sato's public expression of a personal desire to meet with the leadership of China and his implied recognition of the PRC as the sole, legitimate representative of China.[52] His remark was followed by the 1972 Foreign Ministry white papers that explicitly stated that the normalization of relations with the PRC should be the state's most important foreign policy objective.[53] This new foreign policy direction also reflected the voices of the Japanese business community, who wished to normalize economic relations with the PRC.[54]

However, Sato's commitment to maintaining Japan's security relationship with Taiwan constrained the prime minister from leading Japan's foreign policy in the new direction. His reluctance to abrogate Japan's peace treaty with Taiwan led to China's

---

[49] Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 503-4.
[50] Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety*, 112; Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 289-93.
[51] Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 332.
[52] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 104.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ito, *Alliance in Anxiety*, 80.

criticism of Japan as a reactionary state.[55] Beijing also criticized Japan's allowing the US use of military bases in Japan for the defense of Taiwan.[56]

The Tanaka Administration stepped up the pace of these overtures to normalize relations with China by shifting the previous commitment to Taiwan. This policy change was welcomed by the PRC's leadership. Then China introduced conciliatory actions toward Japan.[57] The culmination of the rapprochement process was the summit between Japan and the PRC in September 1972, which was hailed as a new historic chapter in Japan's relations with China. The joint communique from the summit affirmed the termination of the state of war that had existed between the two states and the establishment of full diplomatic relations. It also affirmed the determination of the two states to uphold principles of peaceful coexistence on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty. The Chinese leadership further made it clear that China neither perceived a threat from nor posed a threat to Japan.[58] Tanaka's visit to Beijing thus contributed to the lessening of Japanese threat perception.

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 97-9.

[56] Cable from US Embassy in Tokyo to US Department of State, "Talking Paper on Japan PRC Normalization," 15 July 1972, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

[57] For example, the Chinese government relaxed the following five preconditions for launching a dialogue with Japan, which it had established in 1953: (1) the abolition of the security treaty between the United States and Japan, (2) the recognition of the PRC as the only legitimate government of China, (3) the recognition of Taiwan as a part of mainland China, (4) support for the PRC's entry into the United Nations and the expulsion of Taiwan from the international organization, and (5) support for the withdrawal of the US forces from Taiwan. Additional conciliatory actions included the cessation of derogatory newspaper and radio propaganda against Japan and the assurance of the Chinese leadership to shelve historically sensitive territorial disputes with Japan. See Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 105.

[58] Welfield, *An Empire in Eclipse*, 319.

2.2. Japan's Minimalist Defense Posture during the 1970s

2.2.1. The Rise and Fall of the Independent Defense Concept

The Nixon administration's military retrenchment allowed Japanese voices demanding the state's establishment of an independent defense capability to rise. The concern about the reliability of the patron's commitment made Arita Kiichi, the director-general of the Defense Agency of Japan (JDA), argue that "if the arrival of the US help were delayed, Japan must be able to prevent any aggressor from achieving a *fait accompli*."[59] This argument led to the suggestion of an autonomous defense posture in a draft white paper, which was later called the Arita Paper. In this paper, he urged that Japan acquire defense capabilities sufficient for preventing invasion by other states, securing the safety of sea transportation, and maintaining air supremacy.[60] The Arita paper was targeted to enable Japan to resist an invasion without security support of the United States. This paper, however, was not formally approved by the Sato Cabinet before Arita was replaced by Nakasone Yoshiro in January of 1970.

The debate on the development of an autonomous defense capability was fueled when Yasuhiro Nakasone was appointed as the new director-general of the JDA. Known to be a defense hawk, he had publicly espoused the necessity of establishing an autonomous defense posture to assume primary responsibility for its defense while

---

[59] Makato Momoi, "Basic Trends in Japanese Security Policies," in *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan*, ed. Robert A. Scalapino (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1977), 347.
[60] Joseph P. Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1993), 46.

claiming the state's security dependence upon the United States should be reduced.[61] Upon becoming the director-general of the JDA, he initiated a policy review of the Basic Principles of National Defense (BPND), which had defined the state's defense posture since 1957. The 1957 BPND affirmed Japan's avoidance of major rearmament, the state's dependence on the security commitment of the United States, and the emphasis on a gradual defense buildup in accordance with domestic conditions.[62] His criticism was that the BPND had made the Japanese people lack the will to defend their own country and made the state depend on the patron's commitment to an unacceptable degree.[63] Thus, Nakasone took the initiative in proposing the revision of the BPND, shifting the priorities in the state's security policy formation "away from the maintenance of the U.S.-Japan Security relationship and toward the development of an autonomous defense."[64]

Nakasone's emphasis on autonomous defense as the guiding principle of the state's security policy was also evident in his taking the initiative in the publication of the state's first defense white paper in October of 1970.[65] The white paper started with his criticism that there had not been any firm and unified opinion among the Japanese policymaking elites about how the security of Japan should be achieved. His idea was that the Defense Agency should take the initiative in stimulating greater defense consciousness among the

---

[61] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 143.
[62] Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 38.
[63] His criticism was focused on the fourth clause of the 1957 BPND, which declared that Japan would "deal with external aggression on the basis of the Japan-U.S. security arrangements, pending the effective functioning of the United Nations in the future in deterring and repelling such aggression." See Michael J. Green, *Arming Japan: Defense Production, Alliance Politics, and the Postwar Search for Autonomy* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1995), 55.
[64] Ibid.
[65] In his interview for the U.S.-Japan Project, Noboru Hoshuyama, who served as officer in the JDA, witnessed Nakasone's initiative within the JDA in preparing for the white paper. This interview is available at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/japan/hoshuyamaohinterview.htm.

Japanese public.[66] His emphasis on the promotion of the defense consciousness was similar to the Sato Government's launching of a comprehensive campaign in 1968 to raise the public's defense consciousness, which stressed national pride, social order, and traditional values, and rally support for the state's negotiation of the return of Okinawa from the United States.[67]

While defining the notion of autonomous defense as the state's efforts to increase national defense potentials and the state's determination to deal with aggression primarily on its own, the paper proposed that the Mutual Security Treaty between Japan and the United States should supplement Japan's own autonomous capabilities for defense. Like the Arita Paper, it insisted on the realization of the superiority of the state's military capabilities in the air and at sea.[68] As the US Embassy in Tokyo emphasized, the most significant aspects of the white paper were "the fact of its publication" and the emphasis on "the collective will of the Japanese people to defend their country."[69]

A final point to note is Nakasone's emphasis of the notion of *kokusanka* (indigenization) in defense production as essential to the state's autonomous defense posture. His policy paper, entitled the Basic Policy on Equipment Production and Development, emphasized the importance of *kokusanka* as follows: "From the standpoint of autonomous defense, it is desirable for Japan to be defended with equipment developed and produced by Japan alone. From this point on, the development and

---

[66] Yasuhiro Nakasone, *The Making of the New Japan: Reclaiming the Political Mainstream*. Trans. Lesley Connors (New York: Routledge, 1999), 161.
[67] Thomas U. Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 96.
[68] Momoi, "Basic Trends in Japanese Security Policies," 347.
[69] Airgram from US Embassy in Tokyo to US Department of State, "The Government of Japan's White Paper on Defense," 18 December 1970, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

production of military equipment will be limited to Japanese industries as a matter of principle."[70] The emphasis of the importance of indigenous defense caused the JDA to attempt to financially support the state's fourth five-year defense buildup plan, which ran from 1972 to 1977. Under the new defense plan, the JDA proposed to increase the state's R&D budget by 350 percent, a budget increase of 220 percent over the third defense buildup plan. This was unprecedented in its scale.[71]

Nakasone's emphasis of the importance of *kokusanka* was also welcomed by the Japanese business community, which had demanded an increase in the domestic production of military equipment. The Defense Production Committee of the *Keidanren* (Japan Business Federation) thus attempted to catch up to the enthusiasm of Nakasone, releasing a paper that promised to increase its own capital investment in defense production and R&D.[72] These cases showed that the espousal of the notion of kokusanka could lead to the Japanese leadership's efforts to mobilize domestic resources in the establishment of an autonomous defense capability.

However, there was growing concern that the campaign to prioritize the development of an autonomous defense posture would negatively affect Japan's security relationship with the United States. According to these concerns, emphasizing the concept of autonomous defense would further encourage the patron's disengagement from Japan and East Asia because it would signal to the patron that Japan would no longer need its security commitment.[73] In addition, Prime Minister Sato was concerned

---

[70] Green, *Arming Japan*, 57.
[71] Ibid., 59.
[72] Ibid., 58.
[73] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 145.

that the campaign for autonomous defense would jeopardize the negotiations regarding the reversion of Okinawa. Thus, he attempted to restrain Nakasone, though he initially supported the quest to augment the state's defense capabilities.[74] Even Nakasone himself downplayed the concept of autonomous defense when faced with the possibility of the patron's drastic disengagement.[75]

The setback of Nakasone's campaign became conspicuous as it came to lose domestic political support. Most political leaders of the ruling party turned their backs on Nakasone because of the concern about the misgivings of neighboring countries and the consideration of domestic criticism of Nakasone's initiative.[76] Even the Japanese business community came to withdraw its support for Nakasone's campaign because of its expectation that the prospect of normalized relations with the PRC would create business possibilities that would far outweigh those of indigenous defense production.[77]

In addition, Nakasone's initiative came to face resistance from the state's policymaking agencies. He attempted to bypass the Japanese decision-making process. But this bothered relevant agencies, such as the Ministry of Finance and the National Defense Council, which in turn led to their strenuous resistance to the JDA's initiative in

---

[74] Fintan Hoey, "The Nixon Doctrine and Nakasone Yasuhiro's Unsuccessful Challenge to Japan's Defense Policy, 1969-1971," *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 19, no.1 (2012): 52-74.

[75] He argued that "it was necessary to send a warning signal [to the United States] in order to keep US forces or to encourage their comeback" when a bold US base realignment plan in November of 1970 spurred concerns about the patron's disengagement from Japan. Quoted in Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 145-46.

[76] Liang Pan, "Whither Japan's Military Potential? The Nixon Administration's Stance on Japanese Defense Power," *Diplomatic History* 31, no.1 (2007): 139. The PRC's leadership indeed criticized the JDA's proposed version of the Fourth Defense Plan for aiming to increase Japan's offensive operations overseas. Regarding the PRC's criticism, see Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 47.

[77] Green, *Arming Japan*, 60.

the process of preparation.[78] In particular, the Finance Ministry criticized the JDA's proposed version of the state's defense buildup plan for being "fiscally impossible." Thus, it proposed a postponement of the defense buildup plan. Facing such a situation, the JDA announced its plan to examine significantly reducing the scope of the fourth defense buildup. According to this plan, annual growth in defense expenditure would fall from the originally proposed 18.8 percent to the 15 percent level seen in the third defense buildup plan.[79]

This episode of the rise and fall of the Nakasone campaign shows that the Japanese concern about the reliability of the US commitment led to a campaign to prioritize the establishment of the state's autonomous defense capabilities. It reflected the idea that Japan's economic and political power should be significantly directed toward the state's military power.[80] The return of Okinawa and the Nixon Administration's retrenchment made a group of political leaders in the ruling party and the Japanese business community espouse the state's assertive posture to security. Nakasone's campaign was thus supported by these domestic groups.[81] It was also supported by the Japanese military.[82] There was a good chance of Japan's more self-assertive posture to security if Nakasone's campaign had been implemented as it stood.[83] However, it could not sustain the political momentum it had built.

---

78 Pan, "Whither Japan's Military Potential?" 139.
79 Green, *Arming Japan*, 60.
80 The US Department of State dubbed this idea "big power" psychology. See US Department of State, "Japanese Defense Alternatives," 3 August 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.
81 Green, *Arming Japan*, 59.
82 Noboru Hoshuyama's interview for the U.S.-Japan Project. He served as an officer at Japan Defense Agency. This interview is available at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/japan/hoshuyamaohinterview.htm.
83 Pan, "Whither Japan's Military Potential?" 139.

The episode of the rise and fall of the autonomous defense doctrine suggests that a study of Japan's defense posture should first focus on how the state's assessment of international security environment affects its formulation of a defense posture and then examine how the state's domestic political constraints affect its approach to defense and national security. This section applies this two-step approach to the study of how the Japanese leadership's security assessment in response to détente affected the formulation of Japan's defense posture during the 1970s. In doing so, the present study highlights the causal connection between the leadership's security assessment and the establishment of Japan's minimalist approach to security during the 1970s. Two cases that illustrate the development of the minimalist approach are the establishment of the Standard Defense Force Concept to set limits on the state's defense capability and the establishment of the one percent of GNP limit to defense spending. These two cases suggest that the Japanese leadership did not have an incentive to consider increasing the societal contribution toward national military preparedness.[84]

2.2.2. The Establishment of the Standard Defense Force Concept

The debate over Japan's defense posture during the 1970s was characterized as bureaucratic dominance over politicians in the defense decision-making process. The ruling party did not exercise influence over the process of formulating the state's defense posture because it wanted to avoid aggravating tensions over the defense issue.[85] This

---

[84] Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 60
[85] Ibid.

made it possible for Takuya Kubo and his team of civilian officials in the Defense Agency of Japan (JDA) to take the initiative in the formulation of Japan's defense policy-making process.[86]

As the director of the JDA, Kubo took the initiative in articulating the state's defense posture during the development of détente in Northeast Asia. Referring to the trend toward détente, his seminal internal memorandum in 1971 suggested that Japan would be unlikely to become embroiled in a large-scale conflict in the near future and that hence, it would be unnecessary to decide the scope of the state's defense posture to cope with a large-scale attack that potential adversaries might bring to bear on Japan.[87] This led to the argument that Japan's defense posture should be established based on lowering the assumed level of threat from a large-scale limited attack to a hypothetical conflict of limited scale.[88]

Kubo's threat assessment led to his criticism of the Necessity Defense Force Concept, which was the basis for the previous three defense buildup plans. It postulated that Japan should maintain defense capability in proportion to the potential military capabilities of surrounding countries.[89] In contrast, Kubo suggested the Standard Defense Force Concept as the general guideline for the state's defense planning, which proposed the creation of a standard defense force, consisting of a relatively small, modern, well-equipped, and highly professional military force, which would be

---

86 Ibid., 19.
87 Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, 102.
88 Takao Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics, 1976-2007* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 2010), 113.
89 Ibid., 111.

appropriate for a peaceful international environment.[90] He argued that the creation of such a force would be more practicable than vainly seeking to maintain the forces that would be needed to deal a full-scale conflict.[91]

The notion of the Standard Defense Force Concept was initially deliberated within the JDA. Then Kubo tried to win the support of the moderate leaders of the ruling party, as well as the political parties and the Japanese public.[92] However, the military leaders within the SDF and the right-idealists inside the LDP suggested three criticisms.[93] First, the threat perception rationale behind the new defense concept was criticized because of its assumption that there would not be any large-scale attack on Japan.[94] Second, there was the criticism that it would be impossible to decide the goal of Japan's defense buildup without considering the military capabilities of neighboring countries. Third, the no-threat argument was criticized for assuming that there would not be any drastic change in the international situation. As the head of the JDA, Michita Sakata supported Kubo and civilian officials within the defense agency by persuading the SDF to accept the newly suggested concept.[95]

The Standard Defense Force Concept provided the intellectual foundations for the National Defense Program Outline (NDPO) in 1976, which was Japan's first

---

[90] Pan, "Whither Japan's Military Potential?" 140.
[91] Regarding this criticism, Hoshuyama points out that "Kubo felt as we did that why should we try to attain a higher goal when we had yet to achieve the lowest limit level of peacetime defense capability … … we should first meet the lowest level requirements … … before we jumped ahead of them to something new." See Hoshuyama's interview for the U.S.-Japan Project.
[92] Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, 104.
[93] Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 116-17.
[94] Hoshuyama says that the Japanese military criticized Kubo's security assessment, simply dubbing it as "threat escape."
[95] Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 123.

comprehensive defense strategy since the end of World War II.[96] The 1976 NDPO stated that the "most appropriate defense goal would seem to be the maintenance of a full surveillance posture in peace time and the ability to cope effectively with situations up to the point of limited and small-scale aggression."[97] This shows that the new defense concept became the core of the state's defense strategy. The drafters of the NDPO also tried to make the Japanese public and the opposition parties accept the new concept by emphasizing that it could be used to restrain the quantitative buildup of the SDF.[98]

However, the 1976 defense plan also reflected the debate between the proponents and critics of the rationale behind the Standard Defense Force Concept. First, the debate was about how to set a limit on Japan's defense capability. The JDA initially envisioned the level of defense capability in peacetime as the upper limit of the state's defense maintenance. In this respect, Sakata regarded the 1976 NDPO as a means of curbing Japan's increase in defense capability.[99] Subsequently, however, it became the predominant opinion that the 1976 defense plan should define the minimum level of the state's defense maintenance.[100] This change was the outcome of Kubo's compromise with the existing criticisms of the new defense concept.[101] Second, the drafters of the 1976 defense plan came to emphasize the role of the security commitment of the United States as a means of coping with a hypothetical large or even full-scale conflict.[102] This emphasis suggests that the 1976 NDPO accepted the criticism that the formulation of

---

[96] Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, 102.
[97] http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/docs/19761029.O1E.html.
[98] Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 122-23.
[99] Ibid., 126.
[100] Ibid., 115.
[101] Ibid., 119.
[102] Ibid., 113.

Japan's defense posture should consider the possibility of a drastic change in the international security environment.

2.2.3. The Establishment of the One Percent of GNP Limit to Defense Spending

Throughout the creation of the 1976 NDPO, conflicts between the proponents and opponents of the Standard Defense Force Concept were resolved through an incremental process. Given the absence of political leadership in the formulation of the state's defense posture, the Japanese decision-making bureaucrats introduced incremental measures to manage political conflicts because of their willingness to develop a prior consensus on defense issues instead of risking a bruising political battle.[103] One may want to refer to this distinctive process of defense policy formation to explain the establishment of the minimalist approach to Japan's defense posture.[104] To explain why this approach initially emerged as the dominant strategic doctrine, however, the present study argues that one should examine how the Japanese leadership's threat assessment affected the decision to set the scope of the state's defense posture.

This argument also applies to a study of Japan's low level of defense spending. Existing scholarship explains the relatively low expenditure of national wealth on defense by referring to Japan's structural features. This perspective focuses on the following two features to explain the establishment of the longstanding 1 percent of GNP limit on

---

[103] Sun-Ki Chai, "Entrenching the Yoshida Defense Doctrine: Three Techniques for Institutionalization," *International Organization* 51, no.3 (1997): 401; Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 4-5.
[104] Chai, "Entrenching the Yoshida Defense Doctrine."

defense spending: the existence of strong counter-pressures from the industrial and societal sectors regarding the state's establishment of a defense posture, and the relatively subordinate status of the JDA and other pro-defense forces within the Japanese policymaking structure.[105] The emphasis of these features led to the characterization of Japan's defense spending decision-making process as "residual" in the sense that bureaucratic influence restricts changes in defense spending to an incremental pace.[106] This budgetary incrementalism helps to manage conflicts among relevant bureaucrats by relegating disputes to the budgetary process, enabling the Ministry of Finance (MOF) to exert a substantial influence on defense spending.[107] It also makes it difficult for the Japanese government to make substantial increases in defense spending, even in the face of external pressure to increase the state's security.[108]

While acknowledging the existing scholarship, the present case study criticizes it for disregarding the question of why the Japanese government came to establish the one percent of GNP limit on defense expenditure during the mid-1970s, when Northeast Asia witnessed the development of détente. Japan's defense expenditure had remained under one percent of GNP since it first dipped under that ratio in 1967.[109] Then, the ruling party came to decide, in November of 1976, to limit the state's defense expenditure to one percent of GNP.[110] The present study argues that the introduction of the principle of the

---

[105] Kent E. Calder. *Crisis and Compensation: Public Policy and Political Stability in Japan, 1949-1986* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 411-39.
[106] Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 5
[107] Ibid., 21.
[108] Ibid., 5.
[109] Calder, Crisis and Compensation, 415.
[110] Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 57

one percent limit reflected the Japanese leadership's security assessment in the face of the development of détente in the Northeast Asia.

To begin with, Prime Minister Tanaka emphasized the one percent limitation framework based on Kubo's assessment that the development of the détente substantially decreased the security threat to Japan.[111] He referred to the framework to deal with the external and internal concerns regarding the military implications of the rapid economic growth of Japan. In his talks with the PRC's premier Zhou Enlai in September of 1972, which was the first meeting between the two states' leaders to establish diplomatic relations, he informed Chou that the limit of Japan's defense spending would be one percent of GNP. Chou gave his tacit consent to Tanaka's commitment to limit the scope of Japan's defense buildup. The one percent limit framework was thus used to relieve the PRC's concern about the resurgence of Japanese militarism.[112] The ruling party also moved to place a quantitative constraint on the state's defense spending to offset domestic criticisms regarding the absence of a clear limit on the state's defense spending. This led to the decision on the part of the ruling party, in November of 1976, to limit the state's defense expenditure to within one percent of GNP.[113]

Kubo's security assessment also affected the JDA's position regarding the level of defense spending within the framework of the Fourth Defense Buildup Plan, which would run from 1972 through 1976. He argued that the state's defense budget should remain less than one percent of GNP. This argument was acknowledged within the JDA.

---

111 Ibid., 50.
112 Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 107.
113 Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 56-7.

However, he had to compromise, considering that the increased costs associated with a qualitative improvement of the state's defense capability and the possibility of an economic downturn could cause defense expenditures to exceed the one percent ceiling.[114] In addition, the JDA contended that setting a limit on the state's defense budget of less than one percent of the GNP would be undesirable because Japan would need to show its intent to increase the security burden to the United States. This led to the argument that the state's defense expenditure should be limited to around one percent of GNP. In comparison, the MOF insisted that the defense budget should remain strictly within one percent of GNP.[115] This suggests that the two agencies reached a consensus about the necessity of setting a limit on the level of defense expenditure, regardless of their different approaches.[116]

It should be noted that the JDA's position above was substantially different from its previous position on the level of defense spending. The JDA appealed for an increase in defense spending to two percent of GNP within the framework of the Third Defense Plan, which ran from 1967 through 1971. This proposal was opposed by the MOF, the Economic Planning Agency, and the MITI, which jointly argued that such a high rate of defense spending would interfere with economic growth and squeeze other budgets.[117]

---

[114] Ibid., 57. This argument made the JDA oppose the proposal of the MOF, which linked the 1976 NDPO with the one percent framework. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs supported the position of the JDA, which enabled this agency to keep the two issues separate. Regarding the interagency debate, see Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 127-28.

[115] Ibid., 126-27.

[116] Prime Minister Miki intervened in the interdepartmental debate on behalf of the MOF. However, he also allowed Sakata to change the wording of the draft of the Fourth Defense Buildup Plan to ensure that the one percent ceiling would not become absolute. The revised version of the Fourth Defense Buildup Plan read as follows: "for the time being the aim will be to prevent yearly defense expenditures from exceeding One Percent of GNP." See Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 57.

[117] Ibid., 42-3.

The MOF also opposed Nakasone's 1970 proposal that defense expenditure should increase by over 18 percent a year.[118] These intergovernmental controversies show that there was no consensus about how to set a limit on the level of defense spending.

The establishment of the principle of the one percent of GNP limit on defense spending, coupled with the introduction of the Standard Defense Force Concept, prevented any attempt to bring about a major change in the state's defense posture. The leadership of Japan did not have an incentive to introduce large-scale domestic drives to direct national resources toward defense capability build-ups. Consequently, Japan did not witness any substantial efforts on the part of the government to increase the societal contribution to national military preparedness during the 1970s, when the development of détente in Northeast Asia substantially ameliorated the Japanese government's security concerns. This was the context in which the US Department of State suggested the following conclusion: "Since there is no prospect under foreseeable circumstances of getting through the Diet a substantially larger defense program, the real question is whether available resources can be spent more effectively."[119]

---

[118] Ibid., 52.

[119] US Department of State, "Japanese Defense Alternatives," 3 August 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

2.3. Japan's Military Policies to Honor the U.S. Strategic Interests

2.3.1. Japan's Disengagement from Nuclear Weapons Development

The examination of Japan's security assessment during the 1970s finds that this regional state's security concern was not serious. According to the theory of this research, Japan was supposed to be unwilling to pursue a military policy that would jeopardize the strategic interests of United States. The present study discusses the Japanese leadership's decision to disengage from nuclear weapons development as a case to illustrate the regional state's unwillingness to pursue military behaviors against the patron's strategic interests.

The foreign policymaking agencies within the Nixon Administration were divided regarding the scope of Japan's security efforts in response to the US retrenchment. This interagency debate became unproductive because of the uncommitted stance shown by Nixon and Kissinger.[120] This situation led to the Nixon Administration's dilemma regarding how much it should ask the Japanese government to do in terms of increasing its military capabilities.[121] It was also divided regarding how to prevent Japan from being remilitarized. The Defense and State Departments commonly emphasized the necessity of security reassurance to constrain the resurrection of the remilitarization, while Kissinger and his NSC team sought to balance a resurgent Japan in the balance-of-power system among the great powers.[122]

---

[120] Pan, "Whither Japan's Military Potential?" 121-26.
[121] Ibid., 111.
[122] Hoey, "The Nixon Doctrine and Nakasone Yasuhiro's Unsuccessful Challenge to Japan's Defense

The internal division regarding how to guide the development of Japan's defense posture led to the superpower's ambiguity toward Japan's pursuit of nuclear weapons. This ambiguity came from the conflict between the necessity of constraining the resurgence of Japan as a great military power and the Nixon administration's encouragement of Japan's nuclear weapons development. On the one hand, the Nixon Administration reached the conclusion that Japan's reemergence as a great military power was not in America's interests.[123] This conclusion led to the suggestion that the US policy stance should be "to encourage and support moderate increase and qualitative improvements in Japan's defense forces but to avoid pressure for substantially larger forces or a larger regional security role for Japan."[124] On the other hand, the Nixon Administration indeed encouraged Japan's nuclear weapons development because of its belief that nuclear capability would make Japan assume greater responsibility for its own and regional defense.[125] Throughout the negotiation over the reversion of Okinawa to Japan, Nixon broadly hinted that the US would understand if Japan decided to go nuclear.[126] In addition, the impending SALT 1 agreement was a chance to include Japan's nuclear role in the US strategy in East Asia because the treaty could lead to a reduced US nuclear posture in East Asia.[127]

Policy," 54-6.

123 Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 498.

124 US Department of State, "Japanese Defense Alternatives," 3 August 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

125 Schaller, *Altered States*, 213.

126 Ibid., 218.

127 Selig S. Harrison, "Japan and Nuclear Weapons." in *Japan's Nuclear Future: The Plutonium Debate and East Asian Security*, ed. Selig Harrison S (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1996), 14-6.

The ambiguous stance toward Japan's nuclear weapons development was coupled with the controversy within Japan regarding the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Because of its human resources and financial and technical capability to develop nuclear weapons, Japan was one of the main targets for control by the NPT, which was concluded in June of 1968.[128] There also was the emergence of the pacifist opposition to the presence of the US nuclear weapons on the island of Okinawa. The pacifists' tactics were successful in mobilizing the Japanese public opposition to the presence of nuclear weapons within its territory. It was in a political context in which Premier Sato decided to participate in the Non-Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. The Sato Cabinet signed the NPT in 1970, but this was followed by a domestic controversy over whether Japan should ratify the NPT. This controversy mainly occurred because the Japanese government found it difficult to secure a national consensus; all key players in the Japanese political system were reluctant to tie Japan to the treaty's restrictions without having a clear idea of its implications for the security of Japan.[129]

The controversy over the ratification of the NPT suggested that there was a claim to keep the option of developing nuclear weapons capability open. This claim was driven by skepticism regarding the patron's reliability as a security provider. As the US Department of State assessed, there was skepticism regarding the credibility of the US nuclear shield and its overall level of security commitment.[130] It stimulated the nationalist claim that Japan should develop its own nuclear weapons because the patron's nuclear umbrella

---

[128] Yuri Kase, "The Costs and Benefits of Japan's Nuclearization: An Insight into the 1968/70 Internal Report," *The Nonproliferation Review* 8, no.2 (2001): 56.
[129] Ibid., 66.
[130] US Department of State, "Policy Analysis Resource Allocation Study," 6 June 1972, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

would not fully guarantee the security of Japan.[131] Prime Minister Sato himself demonstrated a personal interest in the state's possession of nuclear force in response to China's atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests in 1964 and 1966.[132] This suggested that Japan's ambitions for nuclear weapons arose from its fear of China's nuclear capabilities. The fear of China's nuclear threats, however, did not lead to the development of Japan's nuclear weapons capability, because the Johnson Administration made a repeated commitment to extended deterrence.[133] Still, the Nixon Administration's retrenchment revitalized the Japanese leadership's passion for the development of nuclear weapons capability. It kept the nuclear option alive by emphasizing the necessity of possessing tactical nuclear weapons for defense purposes. The white paper published in 1971, for example, declared as follows: "As for defensive nuclear weapons, it would be possible in a legal sense to possess small-yield, tactical, purely defensive nuclear weapons without violating the Constitution." Prime Minister Tanaka's remark in March of 1973 similarly suggested that "while we are not able to have offensive nuclear weapons, it is not a question of saying that we will have no nuclear weapons at all."[134] Even Kubo, the architect of Japan's minimalist defense posture during the 1970s, underscored his regard for Japan's latent capability to develop nuclear weapons as leverage with which to persuade the United States to maintain its commitment to the defense of Japan.[135]

---

131 Kase, "The Costs and Benefits of Japan's Nuclearization," 66.
132 Kusunoki Ayako, "The Sato Cabinet and the Making of Japan's Non-Nuclear Policy," *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 15 (2008): 30.
133 Kase, "The Costs and Benefits of Japan's Nuclearization," 63.
134 Harrison, "Japan and Nuclear Weapons," 12.
135 Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 128.

Despite its capability and the existence of a motive to go nuclear, the Japanese government finally ratified the NPT in April of 1976 to ensure that Japan would avoid nuclear armament. To be sure, this decision served to honor the US strategy to sustain détente in Northeast Asia. Japan's pursuit of nuclear weapons had the potential to trigger an indefinite arms race between Japan and the PRC, resulting in the deterioration of the stability in Northeast Asia.[136] Furthermore, a nuclear Japan would be perceived as a serious threat by other neighboring states in East Asia.[137] Acknowledging that China would not tolerate Japan's development of nuclear weapons, the Nixon Administration came to emphasize that the presence of US forces in Japan would contain Japan's nuclear weapons development.[138] Japan's ratification of the NPT also reaffirmed its dependence on the extended deterrence of the United States. As a US Congressional report in 1977 pointed out, Japan's avoidance of nuclear weapons development was "consistent with the fundamental U.S. policy premise that major Japanese rearmament, such as the acquisition of independent nuclear capability, would not be in the best interests of either Japan or the United States."[139]

2.3.2. Enhancement of Security Cooperation between the US and Japan

The rationale behind the establishment of Japan's minimalist defense posture was that the state's Self-Defense Force could cope with a small-scale limited conventional

---

136 Ayako, "The Sato Cabinet and the Making of Japan's Non-Nuclear Policy," 35.
137 Kase, "The Costs and Benefits of Japan's Nuclearization," 65.
138 Komine, "The "Japan Card" in the United States Rapprochement with China," 508-9.
139 Keddell, *The Politics of Defense in Japan*, 59.

attack, whereas the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty could cope with a larger scale attack.[140] In other words, Japan would need the US's military assistance, and Japan would only maintain a minimum force appropriate for the peaceful situation of the détente. This suggests that the Japanese government needed to prevent the patron from weakening its security commitment. In addition, there was the Japanese leadership's belief that the US military presence in Japan itself could be reduced as détente would proceed and succeed.[141] Furthermore, there was the concern about the reliability of its patron's commitment, even though Japan's overall security concerns came to be substantially lessened by the development of détente in Northeast Asia.[142] In this respect, Japan needed to prevent the patron from weakening its security assistance by developing the state's defense posture in its favored direction. The present study discusses the Japanese government's movement to institutionalize defense cooperation with the United States as the regional ally's deferential behavior to maintain its security ties to the United States.

The core idea of the National Defense Program Outline in 1976 was to articulate Japan's military role in the alliance with the United States and to develop the desired level of Japan's indigenous defense capabilities to maintain and enhance the credibility of the alliance.[143] The two allies also reached an agreement, in 1975, to create a task-force

---

[140] Sebata, *Japan's Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics*, 113.
[141] US Department of State, "Japanese Defense Alternatives," 3 August 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.
[142] The US Department of State pointed out the existence of the Japanese awareness that Japan's interests would not always dominate US policies. This led to the suggestion to restore Japanese confidence in the United States as a security guarantor. See US Department of State, "Major Problems in East Asia," 6 October 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.
[143] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 147.

to discuss their joint military operations. This agreement ultimately led to the adoption of the Guidelines for Defense Cooperation between the two allies in November of 1978. The Defense Guidelines went further than the 1976 NDPO in emphasizing Japan's military role in the alliance, articulating in detail the division of missions and roles between the SDF and the US military.[144] Thus military cooperation with the United States became central to Japan's stance on its defense policy.

The movement to formalize defense cooperation with the United States reaffirmed Japan's dependence on the patron's security commitment.[145] To be sure, it was consistent with the necessity of the United States articulating the roles of the forces of the two allies. A group of policymakers in Washington had suggested that the two allies should establish the principle of shared responsibilities in the defense of Japan, encouraging Japan to assume a greater degree of defense burden.[146] This led to the articulation of the principle of complementarity and a functional division of responsibilities between the two allies' military forces.[147] Washington expected that the establishment of this principle would serve to maintain the long-term stability of the US-Japan alliance because it would reduce the feelings of resentment toward the US military presence in Japan and help to reassure other nations in East Asia that Japan would not intend to develop a destabilizing long-range military capability.[148]

---

144 Ibid., 146.
145 Berger, *Cultures of Antimilitarism*, 104.
146 US Embassy in Tokyo. ["Linking Base Reduction and Responsibility Sharing,"] 27 June 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.
147 US Department of State, "U.S.-Japanese Security Roles," 27 June 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976. It was Admiral Noel Gayler, Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Forces, who took initiative in introducing this notion into the debate regarding US policy toward Japan.
148 US Department of State. "U.S.-Japanese Security Roles," 27 June 1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976: US Department of State, "U.S.-Japanese Defense Cooperation, Asian Defense Issues," 27 June

One may characterize the Japanese government's movement as the regional ally's strategy to buck-pass to the United States. According to this perspective, the low-level security concerns led Japan to prefer relying on its patron's military support as opposed to other costly alternatives to enhance the state's security.[149] The absence of domestic antimilitarist sentiment during the 1970s may be another factor to explain the Japanese government's movement.[150] These perspectives, however, do not discuss the strategic motive behind the Japanese leadership's movement. This case study argues for the existence of a causal link between Japan's security assessment and its movement to institutionalize defense cooperation with the United States.[151] This argument helps to explain why Japan came to articulate its military role in the alliance, which had the potential to provoke domestic antimilitaristic sentiment.

2.4. Realism, Constructivism and Japan's Security-Seeking Behaviors

Japan's posture to security has been a puzzle, which is not well explained by exclusively relying on any single theory. This suggests that Japan's security-seeking behaviors are not shaped solely by its relative power, interest, normative structure, or state structure but by their combination.[152] In dealing with this complexity, Katzenstein

---

1973, Japan and the United States 1960-1976.

[149] Jennifer M. Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy," *International Security* 29, no.1 (2004): 92-121.

[150] Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 147-50.

[151] This argument refers to the argument that a secondary state is likely to develop "a division of labor with the hegemon" to prevent the latter's disengagement. Regarding this argument, see Galia Press-Barnathan, "Managing the Hegemon: NATO under Unipolarity," *Security Studies* 15, no. 2: 271-309.

[152] Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism," *International Security* 26, no. 3 (2001/02): 167.

and Okawara introduce the notion of "analytical eclecticism" into the study of Japan's security policy. This research strategy "aims to construct original causal modules that reflect the complexity and messiness of particular problems in international life. It does so by lifting analytical elements from multiple research traditions and allowing for the recognition of causal mechanism not anticipated in the analytical frameworks of those traditions."[153]

The notion of analytical eclecticism helps the discussion of the present case study of Japan against the existing scholarship of Japan's security policy. In doing so, this section draws on three groups of existing scholarship: namely, offensive realist, defensive realist, and constructivist schools. This leads to the determination of the relative strength and weakness of each approach in the explanation of Japan's security-seeking international and domestic behaviors during the 1970s.

To begin with, offensive realism posits that the severity of the security dilemma under anarchy causes a state to seek maximization of relative power as a default strategy.[154] The offensive realist school claims that Japan will inevitably emerge as a great power, acquiring massive military capabilities, including nuclear arsenals, as any other economic superpowers are likely to do.[155] Accordingly, this approach suggests

---

[153] Peter J. Katzenstein, *Rethinking Japanese Security: Internal and External Dimensions* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 9.

[154] Regarding this argument, see John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001). But Mearsheimer's case study of Japan finds that Japan pursued a continental-style strategy of aggrandizement instead of pursuing an offshore balancer strategy. In this respect, Snyder argues that Japan is a case to contradict the basic predictions of offensive realism. See Glenn Snyder, "Mearsheimer's World: Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security," *International Security* 27, no. 1 (2002): 149–73.

[155] Christopher Hughes, *Japan's Re-emergence as a "Normal" Military Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise," *International Security* 17, no. 4 (1993): 41-5. Even Waltz follows the offensive realist approach to claim the inevitability of Japan's reemergence as a great power. See Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of

Japan was supposed to introduce a huge-scale security-promoting domestic drive in order to establish an assertive security policy in response to the US strategic posture in East Asia.

This chapter finds that offensive realism does not explain Japan's security-seeking behaviors during the 1970s. There was a good chance of Japan's more self-assertive posture to security if Nakasone's campaign had been implemented as it stood. However, it could not sustain the political momentum it had built. Rather, the Japanese leadership established a minimalist defense posture. In addition, the Japanese leadership voluntarily disengaged from nuclear weapons development even under domestic and international incentives to go nuclear.

Rather the case study supports the constructive school that has established "an invincible case that Japan is in fact an anomaly to realism."[156] The constructivist studies emphasize the following two factors at the domestic level: antimilitarism and the structure of decision-making process surrounding Japan's security policy. On the one hand, the constructivist approach argues that Japan's security policy is formulated within decision-making process that "bias policy strongly against a forceful articulation of military security objectives."[157] Accordingly, the state structure has made it virtually

---

International Politics," *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993): 61-70.

[156] Tsuyoshi Kawasaki, "Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy," *Pacific Review* 14, no. 2 (2001): 225. For example, Katzenstein argues that "there exists no observable relation between Japan's relative position and its security policy" and that "Japan's policy of external security is largely shaped by factors that realist theory excludes from analysis." This leads to the argument that "Japan's security policy will continue to be shaped by the domestic rather than the international balance of power." Chai similarly writes, "The incompleteness of systemic explanations suggests that domestic factors are essential to explaining the anomalous nature of Japanese defense policy." See Peter J. Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Policy and Military in Postwar Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996). 24; 104; Chai, "Entrenching the Yoshida Defense Doctrine," 393.

[157] Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, "Japan's National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policies,"

impossible "for an autonomous and powerful military establishment to emerge in Japan."[158] On the one hand, another group of studies emphasizes the normative context in which the Japanese leadership has developed the state's security policy. According to this group, Japan's military policy "has been – will continue to be – highly constrained by antimilitarist norms," which have been established legally and socially.[159]

The present case study lends support to the constructive argument that the institutional features of Japan's decision-making process have shaped Japan's minimalist defense posture. The establishment of the one percent of GNP limit on defense expenditure was done through an informal interministerial coordination, which was an "institutional expression of the notion that any important defense policy proposal must go through an especially cautious consensus-building process in which virtually all relevant ministries participate."[160] The case study finds that what was inherent in interministerial coordination process was "a strong bias against any military interpretation of Japan's national security requirements."[161] The institutional feature made it virtually impossible for the Japanese leadership to make substantial increases in defense spending.

International Security 17, no. 4 (1993): 92.

[158] Ibid., 86

[159] Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck?" 102. For example, Hook highlights the "persistent strength of anti-militarist attitudes" in Japan, including "resistance to a major build-up in the military." He also argues that "mass attitudes have been of crucial significance in constraining the normalization of the military as a legitimate instrument of state power." Katzenstein similarly claims that "strong reactions to anything that smacks of Japanese militarism act as a social restraint on national security policy," and that "a series of taboos curtail the growth of the military." See Glenn D. Hook, *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 8; Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security*, 116.

[160] Katzenstein and Okawara, "Japan's National Security," 92-3.

[161] Ibid., 97.

But the case study does not support the constructive school's argument that the development of Japan's security policy has been not so much for coping with external threats as for domestic institutional constraints. Rather, it suggests that a study of Japan's security policy should first consider how the Japanese leadership's security assessment affects the policy preference of the state.[162] In addition, the case study identifies the primary role of the Prime Minister and JDA in the formulation of Japan's defense posture during the 1970s. In this respect, the case study finds evidence that challenges the constructivist characterization of the Japanese decision-making structure as the absence of centralized decision-making process.[163]

According to the constructive school, the formulation of Japan's defense posture in the 1970s was highly constrained by anti-militarist norms. To be sure, the Japanese leadership's security assessment was similar to the mass public's belief that "the status quo of minimal SDF armament combined with perceptions of low external threat and the U.S. alliance had worked well for Japan's defense."[164] Thus it did not introduce any dramatic departure from the mass public's favor of a passive stance on security policy, the status quo of minimal armament of the SDF, and minimal defense spending.[165] But

---

[162] In this respect, Pyle identifies a series of international orders, which has served as "profound forces," upon Japanese decision-making. Samuels similarly emphasizes the role of international factors, arguing that the Japanese leadership has been remarkably agile in using international threats to justify the state's military modernization. See Kenneth B. Pyle, *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007); Richard J. Samuel, *Securing Japan: Tokyo's Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007).

[163] Michael J. Green*, Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 69-73; Katzenstein and Okawara, "Japan's National Security," 93-4.

[164] Paul Midford, *Rethinking Japanese Public Opinion and Security: From Pacifism to Realism?* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 60.

[165] Bobrow suggested this conclusion after reviewing voluminous literature about the Japanese public opinion. Midford's review of the public opinion during the 1970s finds the same conclusion. See Davis B. Bobrow, "Japan in the World: Opinion from Defeat to Success," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33, no. 4 (1989): 571-604; Midford, *Rethinking Japanese Public Opinion and Security*, 49-67.

the establishment of the minimalist defense posture was not so much a result of the constraining effect of the anti-militarist norms as a result of the leadership's perception of security.

Public opinion on the enhancement of the security cooperation between Japan and the United States is another case to test the constructivist argument that the formulation of Japan's defense posture has been highly constrained by anti-militarist norms. Japan articulated its military role in the US-Japan alliance, which had the potential to provoke domestic antimilitaristic sentiment. But the case study does not find the existence of domestic opposition to the government's movement. Rather, consideration of the fear of entrapment, which is a realist factor, helps to explain this anomaly to constructivism.[166]

Criticism of the offensive realist and the constructivist schools has led a group of studies to suggest a defensive realist approach to Japan's security policy. On the one hand, this approach criticizes the constructivist school for glossing over the security dilemma which Japan directly faces and for painting "a distorted picture of Japanese security policy as if this core area of national interest hardly existed." On the other hand, the defensive realist school criticizes the offensive realist argument about the inevitability of Japan's reemergence as a great military power under the severity of security dilemma.[167] These criticisms lead the defensive realist studies to take a relatively

---

[166] Izumikawa and argues the importance of this realist factor to explain the absence of domestic opposition to the movement toward the enhancement of the alliance cooperation. According to them, the US disengagement from the Vietnam War substantially lessened the entrapment fear. This explains why the US-Japan alliance increasingly gained popularity from the 1970s. See Izumikawa, "Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism," 131-32; Midford, *Rethinking Japanese Public Opinion and Security*, 56.

[167] Kawasaki, "Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy," 225-26.

optimistic view of the security dilemma Japan faces in the Northeast Asia. This leads to the prediction that Japan will make a moderate attempt to secure itself.[168]

The case study lends support to the defensive realist argument about Japan's security dilemma.[169] Throughout the Sino-American rapprochement process, Washington and Beijing came to an agreement about the US military presence in Japan as a brake on the resurrection of Japan's military expansion. This suggests that Beijing was less concerned about the reemergence of Japanese militarism. In addition, Beijing's agreement to the US military presence in Japan suggests that the Japanese leadership recognized the PRC as a status-quo power in the Northeast Asia. As a result, the security dilemma between Japan and the PRC was substantially mitigated.[170]

The case study also supports the defensive realist argument that the Japanese government has tried to mitigate the misgiving of its Asian neighbors about Japan's assertive military posture.[171] First, the case study finds that most political leaders of the ruling party did not support Nakasone's campaign for autonomous defense posture because of the concern about misgivings of neighboring countries. Second, the Japanese leadership believed that the creation of a standard defense force "would lessen to a degree

---

[168] Christopher P. Twomey, "Japan, A Circumscribed Balancer: Building on Defensive Realism to Make Predictions about East Asian Security," *Security Studies* 9, no. 4 (2000): 171-72.

[169] For a comprehensive review of the defensive realist's discussion of security dilemma, see Taliaferro, "Security Seeking under Anarchy."

[170] In this respect, Christensen argues that the chance for spirals of tension between China and Japan is likely to be great in the absence of a U.S. military presence in the Northeast Asia. See Thomas J. Christensen, "China, the U.S-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia," *International Security* 23, no. 4 (1999): 49-80.

[171] Midford argues that the Japanese leadership has formulated the state's security policy in such a way to dissuade other states from balancing against Japan. Similarly, Twomey characterizes Japan's security policy as a circumscribed balancing, defined as "a propensity to avoid strong counter-vailing alliance, to ignore an opponent's growth in peripheral geographic and issue area, and to avoid offensive strategies." See Paul Midford, "The Logic of Reassurance and Japan's Grant Strategy," *Security Studies* 11, no. 3 (2002): 1-43; Twomey, "Japan, A Circumscribed Balancer," 168.

the concern in the rest of Asia that Japan [would] again become militaristic."[172] Third, the Japanese government enhanced its security cooperation with the United States instead of establishing an assertive defense posture.

The case study also finds that the Japanese government moved to institutionalize defense cooperation with the United States. From a defensive realist perspective, the movement can be characterized as the strategy to buck-pass to the United States.[173] But the case study alternatively focuses on the security motive behind the movement. It argues that Japan needed to prevent the patron from weakening its security assistance. In this respect, the Japanese government's movement can be characterized as the regional ally's deferential behavior to maintain its security ties to the United States. This argument helps to explain why Japan came to articulate its military role in the alliance, which had the potential to provoke domestic antimilitaristic sentiment.

2.5. Chapter Conclusion

This research theorizes that there is co-variation between the level of a state's security concern and the scope of its drives to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that the less negatively a regional state estimates the security implications of the security guarantor's strategic

---

[172] Michita Sakata's interview for the U.S.-Japan Project, which is available at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/japan/sakataohinterview.htm.

[173] Based upon Christensen and Snyder's discussion of alliance behaviors under multipolarity, Lind suggests that the existence of a powerful ally, coupled with the absence of immediate threats makes the Japanese leadership to choose the buck-passing as the state's default strategy. See Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity," *International Organization* 44, no. 2 (1990): 137-68; Lind, "Pacifism or Passing the Buck?" 104.

posture, the less it will be willing to increase the security burden on domestic society. The present research also theorizes that there exists co-variation between the level the level of a regional state's security concerns and the level of its willingness to pursue a military policy against the patron's strategic interests. This leads to the hypothesis that the less negatively a regional state estimates the patron's retrenchment, the less willing it is to engage in a military policy that is against the security guarantor's strategic interests. The present chapter tests the two hypotheses against Japan's security-seeking behaviors during the 1970s.

Regarding Japan's security concerns, the case study finds that the Japanese leadership was indeed anxious over the US reliability as a result of the Nixon administration's abrupt and non-consultative manner in the military retrenchment. In addition, Washington's sudden shift in the US policy toward China led to the erosion of the patron's reliability. Japan was particularly concerned about how its interests would be discussed during negotiations between the United States and China. The Nixon administration's new China policy also made Japan criticize the patron for its disregard for its obligations to its allies.

The anxiety over US reliability, however, did not foster rampant security concern. Rather Japan's security concerns were substantially ameliorated because of the following factors. To begin with, the US military retrenchment in Vietnam decreased the potential for Japan's entrapment in the Vietnam War. This mitigated the Japanese anxiety regarding the security environment. Second, the development of détente in the Korean peninsula ameliorated Japan's security concern. Japan's anxiety over the US reliability was also mitigated by Washington's assurances that it would maintain its security commitment to

Korea. Fourth, Japan's threat perception was substantially mollified as it came to regard the Sino-American rapprochement as a cornerstone in establishing stability in Northeast Asia. More important to the mollification of Japan's security concerns was the agreement between Washington and Beijing about the role of the US military presence in Japan in the stability in Northeast Asia. Japan's advancement of relations toward China was a final factor contributing to the amelioration of Japan's security concerns.

The case study finds that the Japanese concern about the reliability of the US reliability led to a campaign to prioritize the establishment of the state's autonomous defense capabilities. Then the Japanese leadership came to the conclusion that Japan was virtually secure under the development of détente in the Northeast Asia. According to the theory of this research, Japan was hypothesized to restrain itself from introducing domestic drives to promote societal contribution to an autonomous defense capability. The case study suggests two findings to support this hypothesis.

First, the development of détente made Japanese policymakers conclude that Japan's defense posture should be established based upon lowering the assumed level of threat from a large-scale limited attack to a hypothetical conflict of limited scale. This led to the establishment of the Standard Defense Force Concept, which proposed the creation of a standard defense force, consisting of a relatively small, modern, well-equipped, and highly professional military force. This concept represents the Japanese leadership's decision to set a limit on the state's defense capability. Second, the Japanese leadership's security assessment led to the establishment of the one percent of GNP limit to the state's defense spending. Prime Minister Tanaka took the initiative based upon the assessment that the development of détente had substantially decreased the security threat to Japan.

Then the ruling party moved to place a quantitative constraint upon the state's defense spending. In addition, the case study finds that there was inter-agency consensus about the necessity of setting a limit on the level of defense expenditure.

These two movements to set a limit on the state's defense capability prevented the Japanese government from attempting to bring about a major change in the state's defense posture. This suggests that the Japanese leadership was not committed to introducing a large-scale domestic drives to promote domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. The leadership's unwillingness was coupled with the US policy stance to avoid pressure for a substantially large military capability or a larger regional security role for Japan. As a result, the Japanese leadership established a minimalist defense posture.

According to the theory of this research, it is also hypothesized that Japan was not committed to the pursuit of military policies against the US strategic interests. This suggests that Japan was supposed to maintain a deferential military policy toward the US as a default strategy. The case study suggests two findings to support this argument. First, the Japanese government voluntarily ratified the NPT to ensure that Japan would avoid nuclear armament, despite its capability and the existence of a motive to go nuclear. This served to honor the US strategy to sustain détente in Northeast Asia. Second, Japan institutionalized defense cooperation with the United States to maintain its security ties to the patron. This movement was consistent with the necessity of the United States articulating the roles of the forces of the two allies.

To conclude, what was behind Japan security-seeking behaviors was the Japanese leadership's belief that Japan was virtually secure in the international environment.

During the period of détente, the Japanese leadership came to be confident of the US security commitment and, at the same time, was confident that the communist China would not introduce revisionist behaviors. In this respect, Japan was at one end of the spectrum, if we discuss the level of a state's security concern as a continuous variable. The next chapter studies South Korea, which was at the other end of the spectrum.

CHAPTER 3. CASE STUDY OF SOUTH KOREA

3.1. The ROK Leadership's Perception of Security

3.1.1. Nixon Administration's Force Withdrawal from South Korea

The Nixon administration's overall alliance policy was based on the strategy of Vietnamization. This overarching strategy affected the United States (US) alliance with the Republic of Korea.[1] The background for this study was the conflict between the US and South Korea in dealing with military provocation by North Korea during January 1968.[2] The ROK wanted military retaliation but Washington decided on negotiations with North Korea, due to concern about the ineffectiveness of military retaliation and the possibility of escalation into a full-scale war on the Korean Peninsula.[3]

The gap between the US and ROK caused the relationship between the allies to deteriorate. Thus, US president Johnson dispatched former Deputy Secretary of Defense

---

[1] US Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird suggested the term, Koreanization, which he derived from the policy of Vietnamization during the Vietnam War. See Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 63.

[2] First, a band of 31 commandos from North Korea attempted to raid the Blue House, the presidential mansion in Seoul, intending to kill ROK President Park Chung Hee. This incident occurred on January 21, 1968. Two days later, North Korean forces seized the USS Pueblo and arrested its crew. In Washington, the Pueblo incident quickly overshadowed the Blue House raid, and led the Johnson administration to respond with urgency.

[3] Seuk-Ryule Hong, "1968nyŏn Pueblo Sageongwa Namhan, Bukan, Migugui Samgakgwangye" ["The Pueblo Crisis in 1968 and the Triangular Relations among South Korea, North Korea, and the United States,"] *Hanguksayeongu* 133 (2001): 179-208.

Cyrus Vance to the ROK in February 1968 to speak with ROK President Park.[4] Vance assured Park of America's security commitment and promised US assistance to modernize ROK's counter-infiltration and counter-insurgency forces. In return, Park confirmed that the ROK would not retaliate against North Korea.[5] The ROK also urged the Johnson administration to document its obligation to retaliate against any prospective provocation by North Korea but Vance opposed the demand, stating that the US would not officially accept such an obligation.[6] Consequently, the two allies announced a joint communiqué that omitted the US obligation to retaliate against the DPRK.

After his visit to South Korea, Vance recommended a comprehensive review of the US policy toward the ROK. Accordingly, the US Department of State (DOS) compiled a study entitled, US Policy toward Korea.[7] This study suggested that the new US policy should follow two strategic alternatives: "Reduce the present degree of US involvement" and "Temporarily increase our resources input to Korea, helping the ROK to gain as soon as possible the ability to defend itself successfully against an all-out attack by North Korean forces alone, with only US logistic support."[8]

Based upon this suggestion, Washington discussed how the US would implement the strengthening and restructuring of the ROK regular forces and a gradual reduction of US forces from Korea. It needs to be noted that this was the first formal recommendation for a gradual phased reduction of US ground forces from South Korea. The State Department

---

[4] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 57.
[5] DPRK and North Korea will be used interchangeably for stylistic purposes.
[6] Hong, "The Pueblo Crisis in 1968," 201.
[7] Dated June 15, 1968, this study was prepared in the DOS with the extensive assistance of specialists in the Agency for International Development, Bureau of the Budget, Central Intelligence Agency, DOD, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
[8] US Policy toward Korea, 14-26.

study served as a guideline for the formation of a more formal study group within the National Security Council (NSC), which was to consider presidential options on American policy toward the ROK. This NSC study group, however, did not finish its task by the end of the Johnson administration.[9]

With the change of administrations, Henry Kissinger, Nixon's Assistant for National Security, reorganized the NSC. The newly organized NSC included an office conducting integrated studies of US alliance policy with her regional allies. In February 1969, this office issued the National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 27, which called for the continuation of the Johnson administration's Korean study in 1968.[10] After the issuance of the NSSM 27 in February 1969, Kissinger's NSC team took about a year to decide the level of US military presence in South Korea. The outcome of this NSC project was the issuance of the National Security Decision Memorandum (NSDM) 48 on March 20, 1970, according to which the Nixon administration decided to withdraw one division from South Korea – a reduction of 20,000 men.[11]

According to NSDM 48, the Nixon administration consulted with the ROK government a number of times after it informed *ROK president Park* of the decision to reduce the US military presence in Korea by 20,000 personnel by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 1971. On February 6, 1971, the two allies finally gave a joint statement to the press about withdrawing the US 7th Division from South Korea by the middle of 1971 and the redeployment of the 2nd Division stationed at the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). The troop

---

[9] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 62.
[10] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 67-8.
[11] As a result of the withdrawal, about 41000 US troops remained in South Korea by the end of 1971.

reduction was completed on March 27, 1971. The joint statement, however, does not suggest that the Nixon administration was able to create "a situation in which US withdrawals result from President Park's initiative in view of present ROK strength and the agreed need for future improvements in ROK forces."[12]

3.1.2. ROK's Security Assessment in Response to the US Force Withdrawal

While the Johnson administration was reassessing its overall alliance policy toward South Korea, the South Korean government concluded that the US policy toward North Korea would negatively affect ROK security. This concern came from two factors. First, the disparity between the US tepid response to the Blue House raid and its immediate response to the Pueblo Crisis, and the Johnson administration's negotiations with the DPRK led the ROK government to believe that US security commitment would be weak in the face of aggressive North Korean military campaigns.[13] Second, the ROK was concerned that the US appeasement policy would lead North Korea to continue its military provocation,[14] perceiving the prior two incidents of military provocation as part of the adversary's larger plan to conquer the ROK.[15] The ROK's response to the Nixon

---

[12] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 148.

[13] Hong, "The Pueblo Crisis in 1968." Similarly, the Johnson administration's policy toward Vietnam after the Tet Offensive led ROK President Park Chung Hee to conclude that the US security commitment would be fragile in the face of aggressive military campaigns by communist powers. Regarding the ROK's conclusion, see Wookhee Shin, *Suneunggwa Jeohangeul Neomeoseo: Iseungmangwa Pakchŏnghŭiui Daemijeongchaeg* [*Beyond Compliance and Resistance: The Policies of Syngman Rhee and Park Chung Hee toward the United States*] (Seoul: Seouldaehakgyo Chulpanmunhwawon, 2010), 92-3.

[14] ROK President Park insisted that North Korea would "not alter their policy of deliberate humiliation of" the US if they did "not sense determination on our side." See FRUS Korea 1969-1972*,* 325.

[15] From December 1967 on, Park continued to argue that the ROK would face a massive military offensive from the DPRK in 1968 if the US and ROK alliance would not retaliate. This threat perception is clearly expressed in a letter from ROK Minister of National Defense Kim Sung-Eun, who estimated that the DPRK

administration's reduction plan was similar to its response to the Johnson administration's appeasement toward North Korea.

To begin with, South Korea regarded the Nixon administration's force reduction plan as weakening the superpower's security commitment. ROK President Park took the reduction as a message that the US would not rescue the ROK if North Korea invaded again.[16] In his meeting with Kissinger on December 2, 1970, ROK Prime Minister Kim Jong Pil similarly argued that "everyone in Korea understood [US force reductions in Korea] meant a detachment of the US commitment to support [South] Korea and in effect the re-establishment of an Asian defense system."[17]

The Nixon administration's decision to redeploy the 2nd Division away from the DMZ also led South Korea government to believe that the US would weaken its security commitment. The redeployment meant losing the "trip wire" that would initiate automatic US involvement in the Korean peninsula.[18] The ROK government insisted that it would simply refuse to deploy ROK forces to replace the 2nd Division along the DMZ, leaving the most vulnerable route for North Korean attack unprotected. The Nixon administration, however, regarded the ROK's resistance as a ploy and paid it little attention.[19]

---

had focused on offensive military operation since 1965 and had planned to conquer the ROK in the early 1970s, first with guerilla attacks, and then with a conventional assault. Regarding the ROK's threat perception, see Hong, "The Pueblo Crisis in 1968," 197-99.

[16] Don Oberdorfer. *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), 13.

[17] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 215-16.

[18] The notion of the "trip wire" refers to the concept that the US would automatically engage in the Korean peninsula if its forces stationed at the DMZ were attacked by North Korea. For the discussion of this notion, see Doug Bandow, *Tripwire: Korea and U.S. Foreign Policy in a Changed World* (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 1996).

[19] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 64.

In addition, the ROK's lack of confidence in the patron's commitment stemmed from the Nixon administration's mixed signals about the reduction plan. Seoul's initial reaction to the Nixon doctrine was that the level of US troops in the ROK would not be reduced pursuant to the doctrine.[20] The ROK government also believed that its military contribution to the Vietnam War would prevent the Nixon administration from withdrawing the US forces stationed in South Korea.[21] Furthermore, in the summit between the two allies held in San Francisco on August 21, 1969, Nixon confirmed that the US would not apply the Nixon Doctrine to South Korea, stating that he rejected the US domestic proposal to decrease the number of the US forces in the ROK.[22] This led to the general belief in Seoul that the ROK would be exempted from the doctrine.

Nixon's remark at the San Francisco Summit, however, was followed by mixed signals from Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. In his meeting on January 20, 1972 with ROK ambassador Kim Dong Jo, Laird noted to Kim that "pressures for reduction of our forces in Korea are increasing," adding that "[ROK] forces should be modernized before we withdraw any of our forces." This remark led the ROK government to prepare for negotiation with the Nixon administration even though Laird did not say that "any USG decisions [about the withdrawal of US forces] had been made or that there would be any immediate US troop withdrawals."[23]

---

[20] Ibid., 59-60.
[21] Cha, *Alignment Despite Antagonism*, 66.
[22] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 101.
[23] Ibid., 121. Laird's remark about the withdrawal of the U.S. forces was immediately reported to ROK government. This led ROK to recognize the Nixon administration's plan of reducing the U.S. forces from South Korea. Regarding the ROK's concern, see Sang-Yoon Ma, "Anbowa Minjujuui Geuligo Pakchŏnghŭiui Gil: Yusincheje Sulibwonin Jego" ["Security, Democracy and Park Chung Hee's Road: The Origins of the Yushin System Revisited,"] *Gukjejeongchinonchong* 43, no. 4 (2003): 178.

The Nixon administration's ambiguity and mixed signals about its military assistance for the modernization of the South Korean forces also led Seoul to be skeptical of America's security commitment. The ROK government often explicitly linked the timing of the withdrawal of US forces to US assistance for the modernization program, arguing that the level of American military deployment in South Korea should remain unchanged until the ROK military could be sufficiently modernized to offset the reduction of US forces.[24] Due to the difficulty in obtaining congressional approval for the desired level of assistance, however, the Nixon administration did not provide the ROK government with details about the modernization program. It initially planned to inform the ROK of the limited nature of the modernization program and the necessity to seek a supplemental plan to meet the ultimate objective of ROK military self-sufficiency. Kissinger, however, suggested that the US should not inform South Korea, leading the Nixon administration to express support for the modernization of ROK forces in general terms, "subject to approval of the Congress to provide a balanced military assistance program capable of meeting ROK needs."[25] Nixon personally promised to obtain Congressional approval for providing substantially higher military assistance to modernize ROK forces from 1971 through 1975. At the same time, however, he also mentioned significant domestic pressure from the Congress and the public to require US allies to assume a greater share of the responsibility for their own defense.[26]

---

[24] For example, FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 159-161; 170-73; 174-79.
[25] Ibid., 182.
[26] Ibid., 153.

These mixed signals and the Nixon administration's ambiguity about the modernization program led ROK President Park to ask Ambassador Porter for greater clarification regarding the "nature and extent of modernization" of ROK military forces.[27] Park threatened non-cooperation by stating that no joint planning about the reduction would be possible "until "a degree of satisfaction" would be achieved in modernization talks" and the US assurance concerning "[ROK's] security could be given to Korean people."[28] The desire for a stronger assurance for security and US clarification of the modernization program suggests that the ROK became skeptical of the US commitment.

ROK skepticism about US reliability was further deepened by the concern that the Nixon administration would reduce the US forces in Korea even further.[29] This concern was behind the conflict between the US Vice President Spiro T. Agnew and the ROK President Park in their meeting in August 1970 to finalize negotiations about the planned reduction. Agnew suggested the US and ROK publicly announce that they would negotiate the troop reduction and the modernization of the ROK forces at the same time. To Park, Agnew's suggestion implied that the Nixon administration would implement a further reduction of US forces in the ROK. Thus, he refused this suggestion, requesting

---

[27] Ibid., 154.
[28] Ibid., 174-75.
[29] The US Embassy reported ROK leadership concerns as follows: "At the innermost ring of [ROK] concern is that the announced American plan to reduce some troops from the ROK will lead to a total withdrawal, despite US reassurances that a strong force will remain … these early moves at troop reduction by the United States procure [sic] an eventual American desire to retreat from the terms of the defense security pact between the two countries, on which the Koreans have based nearly everything." This report is quoted in Investigation of Korean-American Relations 1978, 66. Similarly, the CIA's report on South Korea, which was dated on December 2, 1970, estimated ROK concerns as follows: "South Korean estimates of the impact of the proposed US troop withdrawal on the actual military balance largely parallel our own. But their frequently expressed concern that North Korea might miscalculate the withdrawals, as a sign of diminished US commitment, reflects their own fears that indeed this may be just the beginning of a general disengagement policy." The CIA's report is quoted in FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 208.

the Nixon administration's commitment to announce there would be no further reduction of the level of remaining US forces. He also made it clear that any future reduction would be subject to ROK's veto.[30]

Because of Park's resistance, the negotiation in August 1970 ended without any agreement. As US Secretary of State Rogers had predicted, the ROK request for full prior consultation was the most controversial point during the US-ROK negotiation of American troop reduction.[31] The US disregard of this request, however, led the ROK government to set aside its request for the Nixon administration's assurance against further military reductions in Korea.

The Nixon administration indeed regarded the modernization of ROK forces as a precondition to implement further reduction of the US military. According to the NSDM 48, "Further withdrawals of substantial numbers of US personnel beyond the 20,000 personnel decided upon are not now planned, though they may be considered when substantial ROK forces return from Vietnam or compensating improvements in ROK forces are well underway."[32] Nixon also directed the DOD to evaluate the feasibility and timing of further troop reductions in Korea.[33] Accordingly, Laird called for the phased withdrawal of all US forces from South Korea, with the first cut of 20,000 troops to be followed by another cut several years later.[34] The US Embassy in the ROK also internally studied the possibility of reducing US ground combat forces in the ROK in FY

---

[30] The ROK Department of Foreign Affairs, "Summary Memorandum of Conversation between ROK President Park Chung Hee and US Vice President Agnew, Spiro T. August 24, 1970 to August 26, 1970," Microfilm Number C-0042, File Number 10, Frame Number 185-253.
[31] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 197.
[32] Ibid., 149.
[33] Ibid., 150.
[34] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 63.

1974, and even complete withdrawal of ground combat forces from South Korea in FY 1975-1976.[35]

However, the Nixon administration did not carry out the phased reduction plan beyond the reduction in 1971 because neither the US Congress nor the administration favored further reductions until the US-sponsored program to modernize ROK forces was completed.[36] The notion of a phased reduction, however, was revived with Jimmy Carter's campaigning in June 1976, which called for the withdrawal of all of US ground forces in South Korea "on a phased basis over a time span to be determined after consultations with both South Korea and Japan."[37] Carter's plan was not realized because of outright opposition from the ROK, Japan, and even the US military and executive branch.[38] For the ROK government, however, Carter's plan was recognized as the legacy of the Nixon Doctrine.[39]

The Nixon administration disliked the ROK's hardline stand against the reduction plan and its lack of sensitivity to American domestic situations affecting the program to modernize ROK forces.[40] Washington was also frustrated by the ROK government's delaying tactic in deploying ROK forces to replace the 2nd Division along the DMZ.[41] The ROK government further threatened to replace the 7th Division with ROK troops from Vietnam, and unilaterally implemented the withdrawal of ROK forces from

---

35 FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 441.
36 Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 71.
37 Frank Gibney, "The Ripple Effect in Korea," *Foreign Affairs* 56, no.1 (1977): 160.
38 Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 85-94; 101-8.
39 Joo-Hong Nam, *America's Commitment to South Korea: The First Decade of the Nixon Doctrine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 139-174.
40 FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 158.
41 Ibid., 224-26.

Vietnam.[42] Frustrated by this unilateral action, the Nixon administration requested that South Korea not move suddenly with any announcement or decisions of further withdrawals from Vietnam.[43]

The conflict between the two allies suggests that Washington expressed a lack of understanding of the ROK position. As US ambassador to the ROK William J. Porter put it, "From our point of view, the Korean [government] seems to lack confidence in US intentions and our statements, and we do not understand why."[44] The Nixon administration's assessment of North Korea's military threats needs to be discussed to explain its lack of concern for ROK security.

There was a generally agreed estimate in Washington that North Korea would not deliberately launch a full-scale military provocation. The CIA, for example, estimated that "North Korea has no intention of initiating conventional operations against South Korea in the foreseeable future," and that "neither the Soviets nor the Chinese Communists are encouraging such operations."[45] Similarly, the DOS consistently estimated that "under present circumstances, Pyongyang does not intend to invade South Korea; nor do we believe that Pyongyang is deliberately trying to provoke the Republic of Korea into a resumption of major hostilities."[46]

---

[42] Shin, "Beyond Compliance and Resistance," 77. As for the ROK's unilateral withdrawal of ROK forces from Vietnam, the US Embassy in Seoul filed the following account of the Korean press report of an interview with ROK Ambassador to the United States Kim Dong Jo, "Ambassador indicated that the quick withdrawal of US forces might require reappraisal of ROK troops in Vietnam. Said ROK had never been informed or consulted either formally or informally about a reduction of US forces in Korea. Said as long as Vietnam war being fought he did not think US had seriously thought of reducing forces in Korea" This account is quoted in Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 65.

[43] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 290-93.

[44] Ibid., 176.

[45] Ibid., 143.

[46] Ibid., 1.

To be sure, the Nixon administration acknowledged that North Korea would continue its campaign of revolutionary war in South Korea, including "harassment of ROK and US forces in the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and armed infiltration of rear areas."[47] The CIA, however, estimated that North Korea's campaign, which was targeted to create dissonance in South Korea and to discourage US support by generating pressure on the US to withdraw from South Korea, had not been successful.[48] Rather, the US agency estimated that North Korea's campaign of revolutionary war in South Korea ironically solidified South Korean support for President Park and acceptance of his strong rule.[49]

CIA also estimated that the military capability of South Korea would be able to counter North Korea's provocations. It estimated, for example, "[ROK] has developed a sophisticated counterinfiltration system, which includes a national coordinating committee and ancillary operational control centers. The coastal surveillance capabilities have been markedly improved and they have constituted 20 counter infiltration battalions backed up by efficient ROK militia. Perhaps the major factor in the ROK effectiveness has been the dislike of the South Koreans for North Korean regime and the establishment of strong anti-subversion laws."[50] In addition, it suggested the estimate that the overall political stability of South Korea, its booming economy and its military strength would pose "a substantial deterrent to North Korean invasion."[51]

---

[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 24; 143.
[49] Ibid., 206.
[50] Ibid., 143.
[51] Ibid., 200.

The overall estimate of North Korea's intentions and military capabilities, coupled with the US estimate of the ROK's overall capability vis-à-vis North Korea, led the Nixon administration to conclude that its reduction policy would not affect the overall balance of power in the Korean peninsula. As the CIA estimated, "[the] planned withdrawal of one US Army division from South Korea will not of itself significantly alter" the military balance between the two Koreas.[52] Similarly, the Department of State suggested the following conclusion: "If the modernization plan for ROK forces is essentially achieved in terms of equipment, we have no doubt that the bilateral military stand-off can be maintained."[53]

The Nixon administration's estimate of the North Korean threat, however, was substantially different from that of South Korean leadership. This made the ROK government persistently emphasize North Korea's revisionist purpose in the Korean peninsula. In his conversation with US Secretary of State William P. Rogers, ROK Prime Minister Kim Jong Pil emphasized the North Korea's revisionist purpose as, "[North Korea] retains the hope of establishing bases, of damaging South Korean industry, of harassing communication lines, and of compelling the ROKG [ROK government] to thin out its defenses along the front line. Then, if they are successful in this, the North Koreans will launch a general attack."[54] To put it simply, the ROK regarded North Korea's strategy as "liberating South Korea by Force."[55] President Park, in his conversation with Nixon in August 1969, emphasized North Korea's military

---

[52] Ibid., 200.
[53] Ibid., 438.
[54] Ibid., 12.
[55] Ibid., 79.

preparedness to unify the two Koreas by force.[56] The ROK government justified its perception of North Korea by emphasizing the impetuosity and fanaticism of North Korean leader Kim Il Sung.[57]

Because of its threat perception of North Korea, the ROK was concerned that the US reduction policy would inevitably lead to North Korea initiating a revisionist war against South Korea. President Park expressed this concern in his conversation with Nixon in August 1969, saying "[North Korea] during the past 10 years or so has almost completed war preparations to unify the country by force. He is looking for an opportunity to invade the South. He has not done so because of US commitments to the ROK and the presence of American troops in our country. Kim will provoke a war if he believes that this American policy toward the ROK is going to change or has changed."[58]

3.1.3. ROK's Security Assessment under Détente in Northeast Asia

While the Nixon administration believed the military balance between the two Koreas would prevent them from launching deliberate military action against each other, it came to be concerned that a miscalculation by the two Koreas could lead to a major military conflict in the area.[59] This concern led Washington to discuss how the US would

---

[56] Ibid., 98.

[57] After his visit to the ROK in July 1971, Secretary of Defense Laird reported to Nixon, "The theme of Kim Il Sung's impetuosity and fanaticism as the key element in the threat was persistent throughout all ROK discussions." See ibid., 256.

[58] Ibid., 98.

[59] The DOS expressed its concern in this manner, "Thus, the danger over the next year or two is not that war will arise from a deliberate decision of one side or the other, but that it might result from miscalculation—for example, in the process of probing for weaknesses and testing ROK and US resolve, North Korea may overplay its hand and lead the South Koreans to retaliate heavily." See ibid., 2.

stop an independent retaliation by the ROK against a North Korean military provocation.[60]

The US concern about possible military conflict in the Korean peninsula suggests that the military balance between the two Koreas itself was not enough to guarantee stability. In this respect, the Nixon administration needed to explore how it could ease tensions between the two Koreas. As the US East Asian Interdepartmental Group's study of Korea estimated, détente in the Korean peninsula would prevent military confrontation, thus decreasing the risk of US entrapment in a Korean war.[61] The establishment of détente between the two Koreas was also considered important to maintaining the status quo in Northeast Asia, and led the Nixon administration to recommend that the ROK government establish direct contact with North Korea. Accordingly, Ambassador Porter recommended the ROK government to establish direct negotiations with the North Korea on non-political issues, such as postal exchange and the problem of divided families.[62] He also recommended that the Nixon administration needed "a little more leverage" to lead the ROK government to launch direct negotiations with North Korea.[63]

The ROK government showed its own initiative to seek direct negotiation with North Korea when President Park suggested talks on August 15, 1970. This presidential speech was followed by the ROK government's suggestion of Red Cross Talks with

---

[60] Ibid., 59-63.
[61] US Department of State, "Policy Analysis Resource Allocation (PARA) Korea: FY 1973," 14 March 1972, Subject-Numeric Files, RG 59, National Archive.
[62] Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 99-100.
[63] US Embassy in Seoul, "Proposal for Increased Display of US Interest in Dialogue between ROK and North Korea," 18 February 1971, Subject-Numeric Files, RG 59, National Archives.

North Korea. The direct negotiation between the two Koreas began on August 20, 1971 when representatives of the Red Cross societies of the two Koreas met in Panmunjom for the first exploratory discussions, which finally led to the public joint statement of the South-North Communique on July 4, 1972. This statement declared that the two Koreas had reached full agreement that "Unification shall be achieved through peaceful means, and not through use of force against one another," and that "a great national unity, as a homogenous people, shall be sought first, transcending differences in ideas, ideologies and systems." As part of the joint statement, representatives of the two Koreas agreed to take positive measures to prevent inadvertent military provocations.[64] Through closed prior consultations with the Nixon administration, the ROK government also issued the *6.23 Declaration*, which supported the idea of joint membership of the two Koreas in the United Nations.[65]

The ROK government's initiative to launch the inter-Korean dialogues satisfied the Nixon administration's goal to ease tension in the Korean peninsula. President Nixon sent President Park a personal letter with a positive assessment of the ROK's initiative for the Red Cross Talks. He expected that these inter-Korean dialogues would lead "in due course to the development of further communication and exchange with [North Korea]."[66] The development of the inter-Korean dialogue, coupled with the US rapprochement, also led the US Embassy in Seoul to estimate "the danger of major hostilities [between the two Koreas] is less now than at any time since the 1953

---

[64] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 24-5.
[65] Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 116-19.
[66] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 294.

Armistice."[67] Similarly, the DOS welcomed the ROK's 6.23 Declaration in 1973, expecting that this declaration would lead the two Koreas to introduce a step-by-step approach toward perpetual peace in the Korean peninsula.[68]

The development of the inter-Korean dialogues, however, did not change the ROK's threat perception of North Korea. Rather, South Korea persistently expressed its concern about North Korea's revisionist purpose, even during the détente period for the Korean peninsula. President Park expressed his concern, saying, "[T]here are no indications of an imminent attack on the ROK. However, we must always be aware of the Communist capacity to commit aggression at any time. There may be no indications today but [North Korea] has the capacity to attack and can pick the time to do so."[69] Similarly, ROK Prime Minister Kim Jong Pil argued, "North Korea was at a peak in terms of its strength and preparations for war" and that "[T]he North Koreans were already at a maximum state of readiness and all they would do would be to redeploy some of their forces in a more aggressive stance."[70]

It should be inevitable that such concern about North Korea's revisionist strategy led to ROK's belief that North Korea would make use of the inter-Korean dialogue for its revisionist purpose. In this respect, President Park argued that North Korea's intention was to make use of the inter-Korean dialogues to realize its "long-term demand that US forces should withdraw from [South] Korea" and to "try and influence US public opinion to call for an end of US military aid to South Korea."[71] Similarly, he argued that "North

---

[67] Ibid., 437.
[68] Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 116.
[69] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 304.
[70] Ibid., 310.
[71] Ibid., 373.

Korea is trying to mislead the American public through a false peace offensive, thus promoting demand for early withdrawal of US forces from Korea and an end to the (ROK) military modernization program."[72]

The Nixon administration criticized ROK's argument about North Korea's intention. Secretary of Defense Laird expressed his criticism, saying, "The existing North Korean threat is typified on the one hand as large and imminent and on the other hand as quiescent as long as the ROK displays political and military stability. The ROK contends that despite existing and prospective political and military stability, the threat is still high. If the threat is as immediate and intense as the ROK frequently indicates, they could surely sacrifice more in their behalf."[73] The Department of State agreed, stating, "We have no knowledge of any immediate plans or preparations by North Korea for any unusual military operations except exercises. Accordingly … we will have no choice other than to make clear publicly we do not share [the] ROKG estimate … we find [the] ROK campaign out of step with efforts to relax tensions in Asia, and a possible invitation to Pyongyang for adventurism or miscalculation."[74]

South Korea's concern about North Korea's revisionist purpose was coupled with its belief that the Nixon administration's rapprochement with the People's Republic of China (PRC) would negatively affect ROK security. The news of Nixon's opening to the PRC inevitably raised new doubts about the reliability of America's security commitment, because the rapprochement implied "US acceptance of a hostile, powerful and

---

[72] Ibid., 359-60.
[73] Ibid., 262.
[74] Ibid., 296.

revolutionary country in South Korea's immediate neighborhood, tied by a military alliance to North Korea."[75] The ROK government was worried that the Nixon administration's China policy would adversely affect the security of South Korea.[76] Thus, the ROK leaders insisted that there should be neither discussion nor decision taken regarding South Korea by the Nixon administration without consultation with the ROK government.[77]

In particular, the ROK was worried that the rapprochement between the US and PRC would lead to further removal of US forces from Korea, since the PRC had already spoken to Western reporters about "the US getting out of Korea and the abrogation of the US–ROK Mutual Defense Treaty."[78] The PRC's concern about the remilitarization of Japan led it to propose that the US should gradually withdraw its forces from South Korea. Kissinger responded to the PRC's request, saying, "If the relationships between our countries develop as they might, after the Indochina war ends and the ROK troops return to Korea, I would think it quite conceivable that before the end of the next term of President Nixon, most, if not all, American troops will be withdrawn from Korea."[79] Kissinger's response suggests that the Nixon administration regarded the détente between

---

[75] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 13.
[76] According to the US Embassy in Seoul, "Some Korean and foreign observers seemed to doubt the situation on the Korean Peninsula had become so serious. This is understandable given the general trend in the international community toward peace and détente—particularly when relations between the US and Red China are thawing. But when the big powers make an effort to ease tensions, then perhaps some of the weak nations become prey to unexpected incidents. For example, as the US and Red China moved toward each other, the Republic of China suffered from these moves. The Republic of Korea was concerned that it too could become a victim like the Republic of China." See FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 302-3.
[77] Ibid., 279-85.
[78] Ibid., 282.
[79] Ibid., 390.

the US and PRC as a precondition to implement further reduction of the US forces in South Korea.

3.2. The ROK Leadership's Security-Promoting Domestic Drives

3.2.1. The ROK Initiatives to Increase Indigenous Military Capabilities

The documentation of the nature of the ROK leadership's security concern shows that the leadership's assessment of North Korea's threats was filtered through its perception of the US reliability as a security provider. The leadership experienced high levels of threat from the adversary and this threat perception was magnified by its skepticism of the superpower's security commitment to South Korea. Consequently, the level of the leadership's security concern was substantially high. This made the ROK leadership prioritize the state's military capability for self-defense.

President Park introduced the notion of self-defense after the US withdrew the 7th Division from South Korea. In his January 1970 New Year's address, for example, he argued that the ROK should maintain the military capability to defend itself alone against an all-out attack by North Korean forces. Similarly, in his 1971 New Year's address, Park emphasized the ROK's preparedness for self-defense as the only way to deal with the security crisis caused by the US strategic posture in Northeast Asia. He argued that the state's self-defense capability would be contingent upon the South Korean people's willingness to achieve a great national unity. In addition, the president's New Year's address in 1972 emphasized the necessity of promoting the state's industrial base to

support military capability and self-defense.[80] The rapprochement between the US and PRC also evidently led Park to emphasize the necessity of self-defense, stating, "We cannot let our vigilance down at the reemergence of Big Power politics. Just as an individual must protect himself, so a nation must consider security and survival as indispensable. When a nation's survival is at stake, politics, economy, culture, everything should be organized and mobilized for that single purpose."[81]

The ROK government's efforts to develop weapons production began with the president's direction in August 1970 to establish the Agency for Defense Development (ADD) and the Weapons Exploitation Committee (WEC), around the time when the US and ROK negotiated the reduction of the US Forces in South Korea.[82] The ADD openly developed military weapons, equipment and materials and assisted in the development of defense-related technology. On the other hand, the WEC was a covert governmental committee responsible for weapons production and procurement.[83] These two governmental agencies took the primary role in developing weapons production capability during the 1970s. Park also appointed Oh Wŏnch'ŏl as the head of the Second Economic Secretariat (SES) and assigned him the task of creating a blueprint for developing the state's weapons production capacity. As chief of the SES, Oh's tasks included developing skilled manpower, missile capability and nuclear weapons, as well as re-planning the development of national land and modernizing the ROK military.[84]

---

[80] The president's addresses are available online at http://www.pa.go.kr/ .
[81] Chung Hee Park*, Korea Reborn: A Model for Development* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1979), 130.
[82] Hyung-A Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*: Rapid Industrialization, 1961-1979 (New York: Routledge, 2004), 166.
[83] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 79.
[84] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 168.

On November 11, 1971, Park directed Oh to immediately organize weapons production to arm 20 divisions of the ROK Homeland Guard with light weapons. He planned the light weapons development program, which the ADD began to implement under the code name, "Lightening Operation." On December 16, 1971, the ADD completed the production of eight types of light weapons, including M1 carbines, M19 guns, A4 machine guns and 60mm trench mortars. The trial demonstration of these weapons was conducted on April 3, 1972, only five months after the president's direction.[85] A presidential directive to produce 105mm cannons for the armament of Korean regular forces immediately followed the demonstration, so the ADD developed and demonstrated a trial version of the cannon.[86]

The presidential guidance was apparently the driving force behind establishing an indigenous capacity to produce various required conventional weapons. Park directed his chief of staff, Kim Chŏngnyŏm, to deliver his order to both the chief of the ADD and the Minister of Defense so they would begin the production of light weapons immediately, ordering Kim to tell the two agencies, "It's a Presidential Direction."[87] The president's initiative led the ADD to make all-out efforts for weapons production. Park also needed to deal with skepticism from the Department of Defense about the ROK's indigenous weapons production capacity. The DOD did not believe the ROK had the capacity to produce high-quality weapons for immediate use, and suggested that the ROK should depend on US military assistance for the production of required weapons.[88] To overcome

---

[85] Won Chul Oh, *Naega Jeonjaengeul Hajaneun Geotdo Aniji Anhneunya [I am not Planning a War]* (Seoul: HanGukhyeong Gyeongjejeongchaek Yeonguso, 1999), 393-402.
[86] Ibid., 402-12.
[87] Ibid., 391.
[88] Ibid., 391-92.

this skepticism, Park assigned Oh and his Blue House secretaries in the Second Economic Secretariat primary responsibility for planning the weapons production program and allowed the DOD only a secondary role in developing the state's weapons production capability during the 1970s.[89]

Despite the efforts to produce Korean-made conventional weapons, technological hurdles made it difficult for the ADD to produce the required light weapons and 105mm cannons. The ADD did not secure enough engineers and skilled workers to produce these weapons by the time Park decided to launch the weapons production programs. Neither did it have enough data and information to implement the weapons production. Furthermore, South Korean industry could only precisely manufacture items to one-tenth of a millimeter, which was not sufficient to manufacture weapons.[90]

This suggests that the ROK government needed US military assistance to develop her indigenous capacity for large-scale weapons production. Through the trial demonstration of its Korean-made weapons, the ROK was able to convince the Nixon administration to assist the ROK's weapons production. The US consequently provided the ROK with technological advisers and technical plans for conventional weapons production.[91]

But it should be noted that the US also sought to control the development of the ROK's indigenous weapons production capacity in return for its assistance in the process. The Department of State and US Embassy in Seoul were concerned that the ROK's

---

[89] Sang Hui Koo, *Hanguk Bangwisaneob* [*Defense Industry of South Korea*] (Sejong Yeonguso Yeongu Nonmun 98-09, 1998), 29-30.
[90] Ibid., 30.
[91] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 171-72.

initiative for weapons production may have the potential to provoke North Korea, thus negatively affecting the Nixon administration's rapprochement with the PRC.[92] In this respect, the DOS and DOD suggested that US military assistance should focus on promoting the ROK's capacity to produce defensive weapons.[93] The Nixon administration also tried to secure leverage to control the development of the ROK's weapons production program. Accordingly, the US Deputy Secretary of Defense William P. Clement, in the ROK-US Security Consultative Meeting in September 1973, urged the ROK to "consider the desirability of developing joint endeavors which bring together American industrial technology with Korean industry to develop an industrial base capable of supporting Korea's defense requirement."[94]

3.2.2. Military Expenditure and Taxation for Autonomous Defense Capability

Identification of the nature and patterns of ROK defense spending during the 1970s helps to determine how the leadership of South Korea secured financial support from domestic society for the state's military preparedness. According to Table 3-1, the relative weight of ROK defense spending to the state's Gross National Product (GNP) from 1970 through 1979 is 4.75% on average, with the lowest level being 3.2% in 1974 and the highest level being 6.6% in 1979. Intuitively speaking, this indicates that ROK defense spending constituted an important portion of the national economy of South Korea. The

---

[92] Oh, *I am not Planning a War*, 410-11.
[93] Ibid., 399.
[94] US Embassy in Seoul, "ROK-US Security Consultative Meeting – Joint Statement," 13 September 1973, http://www.wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/1973SEOUL06209_b.html (accessed April 16, 2016).

relative weight of defense spending to the state's public expenditure shows a steady increase during the 1970s, from 23.2% in 1970 to 30.8% in 1979. This shows the ROK government's commitment to secure a financial base for the for the state's military capability overall.

Table 3-1. Defense Spending in South Korea, 1969-1980[95]

Year	GNP	Defense Spending	% of GNP	% of Public Expenditure
1969	7.4	0.298	4.0	22.8
1970	8.2	0.333	3.9	23.2
1971	10.0	0.411	4.1	24.6
1972	9.7	0.428	4.4	24.8
1973	12.6	0.475	3.8	28.0
1974	17.5	0.558	3.2	29.3
1975	18.4	0.719	3.9	28.8
1976	24.0	1.500	6.3	32.9
1977	31.5	1.800	5.7	34.7
1978	46.0	2.600	5.6	37.0
1979	48.3	3.181	6.6	30.8
1980	69.3	3.460	5.7	35.6

The pattern of South Korea's defense spending during the 1970s was related to declining US military aid.[96] The ratio of US aid to the ROK's total defense spending dropped from 56.2% to 14.3% from 1969 to 1974. Beginning in 1972, US military assistance was replaced by military loans, but the amount of the loans accounted for less than 10 percent of the total defense expenditure of South Korea. The US completely

[95] Chung-In Moon and In-Taek Hyun, "Muddling through Security, Growth, and Welfare: The Political Economy of Defense Spending," in *Defense, Welfare and Growth: Perspectives and Evidenc*e, eds. Steve Chan and Alex Mintz (New York: Routledge, 1992), 140. The unit of GNP and defense spending is in billions of US dollars and the amount of the GNP and defense spending for each year is adjusted to 1992 prices.

[96] Ibid., 147.

phased out its military assistance by 1978 and continued to decrease the amount of the military loans. This fostered the ROK leadership to establish a domestic financial base to support the state's military capability.

South Korea's defense spending doubled from $719 million in 1975 to $1.5 billion in 1976, and its share of the state's GNP rose from 3.9 percent to 6.3 percent. This sharp increase can be explained by the ROK government's efforts to secure a revenue base for its Force Improvement Plan. To finance this plan, the ROK government initially raised a total of 16.13 billion South Korean won (approximately $32 million in US dollars) between 1974 and 1975 through mass media campaign. In July 1975, the government introduced a compulsory National Defense Tax as the new revenue base for the plan.[97] This enabled the ROK government to spend about six percent of the state's GNP annually on the Force Improvement Plan since 1976. With the introduction of the National Defense Tax, the ROK government set the goal of surpassing North Korea's defense expenditure by 1976.[98] The gap began to considerably narrow as South Korea sharply increased its defense expenditure, and South Korea has surpassed North Korea on defense expenditure since 1977.[99]

It is clear that the ROK government's commitment to financially support the Force Improvement Plan was the result of declining financial assistance from the United States from 1971 through 1975. The two allies' approaches toward this program show the "continuing discrepancy between United States and Korean perceptions of the military

---

[97] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 29.
[98] Sung Gul Hong, "The Search for Deterrence: Park's Nuclear Option," in *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Kim, Byung-Kook and Ezra E. Vogel (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 488.
[99] Correlates of War, National Material Capabilities (Version 4.0).

needs of the Republic of Korea."[100] The ROK indicated that $200 million of military assistance per year from 1971 through 1975 would be required to bring its forces to a state "at which genuine modernization could begin," and that substantial help from the Nixon administration is required in establishing ROK's defense industries.[101] In addition, the ROK demanded that the modernization program should increase its capability to deal with North Korea's infiltration and guerilla strategy.[102] In the end, the ROK government suggested that $3-4 million would be required to modernize ROK forces from 1971 through 1975.[103] The Nixon administration, however, planned to spend only $1.5 Billion for the modernization plan, far less than requested.[104]

For the following two reasons, the Nixon administration even found it hard to obtain congressional approval of the $1.5 billion for modernizing ROK forces. First, the congress was demanding that US allies assume a greater share of responsibility for their own defense, so there was no guarantee that the congress would approve the requested funds.[105] Considering this pressure, the Nixon administration estimated that the ROK's modernization program "would be limited largely to [ROK] ground forces," thus requiring additional money to provide a reasonable level of modernization of ROK naval and air forces.[106] Second, the congress regarded the program as part of the US annual security assistance program, not as a five-year package.[107] This meant that congressional

---

[100] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 87.
[101] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 170.
[102] Ibid., 159.
[103] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 69.
[104] FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 182.
[105] Ibid., 153.
[106] Ibid., 181.
[107] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 69.

approval would be affected by US domestic political currents in any given year. From 1972 through 1975, the actual amounts of modernization funds approved by the congress were indeed less than the amounts requested by the Nixon administration. Consequently, the US fulfilled the modernization program two years after the scheduled completion year.[108]

Table 3-2 presents the structure of South Korea's military expenditures during the 1970s by appropriation categories. This table shows that expenditures related to the purchase of military equipment accounted for only 10.1 percent of the total defense spending in 1970. That percentage increased significantly to 18.1 percent in 1975, and 28.1 percent in 1976. The phase-out of US military assistance and the ROK government's efforts to catch up with North Korea's military capability were largely responsible for the heavy investment in this category since the mid-1970s. In addition, the ROK government allocated a noticeable share of the defense budget to investment in research and development since 1971 to increase the state's self-reliant military capability through defense industrialization.[109]

---

[108] Ibid., 70.
[109] Moon and Hyun, "The Political Economy of Defense Spending," 144.

Table 3-2. ROK Military Expenditure by Appropriation Category, 1970-1979[110]

Year	Military Personnel	Maintenance	R&D	Purchase of Military Equipment	Total
1970	69,073 (67.5)	22,968 (22.4)		10,295 (10.1)	102,336
1971	81,825 (60.7)	38,217 (28.4)	341 (0.2)	14,365 (10.7)	134,748
1972	96.987 (55.9)	55,500 (32.0)	2,054 (1.1)	19,097 (11.0)	173,638
1973	108,131 (58.9)	60,391 (32.9)	2,137 (1.1)	12,971 (7.1)	183,630
1974	144.107 (48.6)	123,153 (41.4)	8,234 (2.8)	21,348 (7.2)	296,842
1975	208,720 (47.2)	141,169 (31.9)	12,726 (2.9)	79,854 (18.1)	442,469
1976	298.920 (42.5)	170,975 (24.3)	36,035 (5.1)	197,818 (28.1)	703,748
1977	393,301 (41.4)	234,943 (24.7)	36,224 (3.8)	285,165 (30.0)	949,633
1978	483,557 (37.5)	336,539 (26.1)	30,878 (2.4)	438,397 (34.0)	1,289,353
1979	591,828 (38.8)	451.776 (29.6)	45,389 (3.0)	436,868 (28.6)	1,525,861

3.2.3. The Development of Heavy Industrialization in South Korea

The ROK leadership's all-out efforts to establish the military industrial base began immediately after North Korea's abduction of a South Korean patrol boat in early June 1970.[111] President Park issued a directive to build the defense industry, and Deputy Prime Minister Kim Hakryŏl proposed constructing core industries to establish the required industrial base.[112] The Economic Planning Board (EPB) was tasked with financially supporting this project, and conducted negotiations over 15 months with

[110] Ibid., 143. The unit is million KRW (South Korean Won) in current price of 1992.
[111] Oh, *I am not Planning a War*, 344.
[112] They included the ally-steel machine-building, plat-iron, and shipbuilding industries.

Japan, the United States and various European countries to secure foreign loans. All of these nations, however, were skeptical of the ROK government's ability to implement the industrialization project, so the EPB was not able to raise the required capital.[113]

This desperate situation ironically led to the most extraordinary development of the ROK's military industrial infrastructure during the 1970s. After the project to construct the four core industries became bogged down, the ROK government needed to find alternatives. Oh Wŏnch'ŏl, then assistant vice minister in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, proposed to Kim Chŏngnyŏm, President Park's chief of staff, his ideas about the state's defense industry.[114] Impressed by Oh's idea, Kim immediately let Oh meet with the president. In the meeting on November 10, 1971, Oh explained to Park his ideas of "choosing the most prominent private manufacturing companies currently available, and assigning them to manufacture either weapon parts or specified quantities," and that development of the state's defense industry should be "managed within the framework of heavy and chemical industry development."[115]

His idea was so persuasive that Park appointed him as his senior economic secretary in the Second Economic Secretariat (SES) in the Blue House. Park's appointment of Oh as head of the SES was the beginning of what was to become the ROK's heavy and economic industry (HCI) triumvirate, which referred to the combined roles of President Park, Kim Chŏngnyŏm, and Oh Wŏnch'ŏl in the management of the HCI program. This combined role was crucial to providing the three ingredients essential for developing the

---

[113] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 166.
[114] Oh, *I am not Planning a War*, 388.
[115] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 167.

defense industry and implementing the HCI program: Park's strong leadership, Kim's expertise in economic management, and Oh's industrial vision.[116] The HCI triumvirate was the driving force behind promoting the state's industrial base for defense capability.

The defense industry program took a giant leap forward when Park declared the HCI Plan as the top priority of the state. This declaration was based upon the HCI triumvirate's conclusion that the state's defense industry should be based upon the production systems of big business, and promotion of the ROK defense industry would be managed as an "integral part of heavy and chemical industrialization."[117] To put it simply, the triumvirate recognized that development of the state's defense industry would be impossible without the infrastructure of heavy and chemical industries. The inseparability of the defense industry from the HCI plan was emphasized during the meeting on January 31, 1973, in which President Park maneuvered his cabinet minister to approve the plan.[118]

Oh's industrial vision brought a fundamental shift from Park's reliance on the economists of the EPB to a reliance on technocrats of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (MCI), as well as the Presidential Economic Secretariat.[119] The Economic Secretariat at the Blue House became firmly ensconced as a critical decision-making body for the formulation and implementation of policies relating to the HCI plan, bypassing and sometimes dictating to the EPB and the Ministry of Finance (MOF).[120] The presidential initiative helped to overcome EPB objections to the state's intrusive

---

116 Ibid., 168.
117 Ibid.
118 Ibid., 176.
119 Ibid., 168.
120 Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 129.

control over the development of industry and the MOF's concern about the loss of monetary policy as a result of the big-push for the HCI plan.[121] This suggests that Park was willing to push for the HCI plan even at the cost of losing monetary policy discipline.[122] At the same time, however, Park was fully aware of the importance of winning bureaucratic support from the EPB and MOF, which commanded indispensable economic resources, controlled the strategic policy network, and possessed the ROK's best bureaucrats. Thus, he continued "showering" the two bureaucratic bodies with organizational privileges instead of simply "silencing" their voices.[123]

Park also established the interministerial Council for Promoting Heavy and Chemical Industries (CPHCI) to prevent the HCI project from getting lost in bureaucratic bickering, and to introduce efficient operational channels for the formulation and implementation of the HCI plan. The CPHCI, chaired by Park himself, was given the mission of "setting the agenda, designing a concerted effort of resource mobilization and allocation, and laying out a division of labor among the economic ministries."[124]

According to the HCI plan, six industries (chemical, electronics, machine-building, metal, ship-building, and steel) were designated as objects of the state's intense scrutiny and development. The ROK government created one large industrial complex with state of the art production facilities for each of the strategic industries by procuring properties from farmers, bulldozing the land and installing the required industrial infrastructures.[125]

---

[121] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 179; Byung-Kook Kim, "The Leviathan: Economic Bureaucracy under Park," in *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra E. Vogel (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 225.
[122] Kim, "The Leviathan," 222.
[123] Ibid., 225.
[124] Ibid., 224.
[125] Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 129.

The ROK leadership also offered the targeted industries various policy supports, such as no pressure for repayment, and the removal of administrative obstacles.[126] In addition, the South Korean government committed an enormous amount of financial support to ensure the success of the HCI drive.[127]

The ROK government established the National Investment Fund (NIF) in 1973, which was funded by issuing national investment bonds and pension funds. In principle, the projected capital for the HCI project would come from this fund. But the South Korean government also secured external capital, putting priority on foreign loans over direct investment or joint ventures. The targeted industrial enterprises were the first to receive financial support from the government and to receive available foreign capital. These governmental efforts enabled the development of strategic industries "completely insulated from commercial pressures and insured from failure by government subsides."[128] Additionally, the ROK government tried to take advantage of all available intellectual input from both Korea and abroad.[129]

Table 3-3. Chaebŏl Participation in Heavy and Chemical Industries.[130]

Chaebŏl	Number of Affiliates		Acquisitions in the Heavy and Chemical Industries
	1974	1978	
Hyundai	9	31	aluminum, automobile*, machinery*, heavy electrical, heavy machinery, iron & steel, oil refining, shipbuilding
Samsung	24	33	electric switching system, general machinery, petrochemicals, shipbuilding
Daewoo	10	35	automobile, machinery, shipbuilding

126 Kohli, *State-Directed Development,* 112,
127 Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 129-31.
128 Janne E. Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea* (London: Macmillan, 1986), 63.
129 Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 184.
130 Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 168.

Table 3-3 continued

Lucky	17	43	electronics*, oil refining*, petrochemicals*
Hyosŏng	8	24	auto parts, heavy electrical machinery, petrochemicals
Kukje	7	22	iron & steel, machinery
Sunkyung	8	23	chemical, machinery
Samhwa	10	30	electrical, machinery
Ssangyong	17	20	cement*, heavy electrical, heavy machinery
Kŭmho	15	22	iron & steel, petrochemicals
Kolon	6	22	heavy electrical, petrochemicals

The state's initiative led to phenomenal success, despite skepticism from international economic development agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the World Bank.[131] As presented in Table 3-3, the governmental initiative led ROK's big business, so-called Chaebŏl, to partake in the targeted strategic industries.

3.2.4. Establishment of the Societal Base of Autonomous Defense Posture

The main goal of the financial system of South Korea during the 1970s was to "hemorrhage as much capital as possible" into the growth of strategic industries required for the development of the state's military capability.[132] A negative consequence of the favoritism toward these targeted strategic industries, however, was the "bifurcation of the financial market," which led the ROK government to allocate relatively few resources to other socio-economic sectors.[133] Consequently, the top-down drive for the HCI project

[131] Ibid., 131-32.
[132] Woo, *Race to the Swift*, 159.
[133] Ibid.

proceeded "in tandem with society's deepening sense of alienation."[134] This suggests that the ROK needed to silence any plausible social tensions inherent in the state's drive for the HCI project.

For this purpose, the ROK leadership launched the Saemaŭl Movement in April 1970, a social campaign to justify the state's big push for heavy and chemical industrialization. It initially began as a top-down campaign for the development of rural areas that largely depended on agricultural sectors. Despite the rhetoric and aims of this movement, however, the ROK's emphasis on the HCI drive led the state to pay very little attention to the development of the agricultural sector. Rather, the Park administration transformed the Saemaŭl Movement into a community mobilization campaign to promote the renewal of the Korean people's spirit of independence, self-reliance and determination to strive for national development.[135] In this regard, the ROK's campaign for the Saemaŭl Movement represented "nationwide spiritual mobilization for state-led heavy industrialization."[136]

This ideological mobilization was also evident in the ROK government's introduction of political measures to secure societal support of the HCI project. The Park administration estimated that the dialogue between the two Koreas would potentially weaken the South Korean public perception of North Korea as a military threat.[137] Similarly, it estimated that the peace offensive of North Korea during the course of the

---

[134] Hyuk Baeg Im "The Origin of the Yushin Regime: Machiavelli Unveiled," in *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra E. Vogel (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 256.
[135] Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 133.
[136] Ibid., 139.
[137] Im, "The Origin of the Yushin Regime," 255.

dialogue was targeted to create a loss of cohesion in ROK's national opinion about North Korean threats.[138] It seemed inevitable that the state's rationale for maximizing national security to deal with the adversary would be also weakened. Such concern led Park to declare an emergency situation on December 6, 1971, exhorting "all people to knuckle down and prepare for [the] worst in [the] name of patriotism and national security."[139] This suggests that the ROK intended to establish "a one voice system to prevent a split in national opinion."[140]

In addition, the Park regime surprisingly announced the establishment of the *Yushin* system in October 1972,[141] accompanied by the state's declaration of martial law, abandonment of the existing constitution, disbandment of the National Assembly, and preparation of a plan for the indirect election of the president. The ROK government also introduced coercive measures to silence domestic opposition toward the Yushin system.[142]

With the establishment of the Yushin system, the ROK government maximized its capacity to penetrate into domestic society. In doing so, it transformed the Saemaŭl Movement into a mass mobilization campaign for the Yushin reform.[143] President Park publicly stated that the Saemaŭl Movement was the same as the Yushin reform and vice versa, the objective of both being to lead every Korean to work hard to build a prosperous welfare state. Following the presidential statement, the ROK government transformed the

---

138 FRUS Korea 1969-1972, 370.
139 Ibid., 297.
140 Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 139.
141 *Yushin* can be translated as "revitalizing reforms."
142 Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 37.
143 Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 141-43.

Saemaŭl Movement to leave no room for any loose ends in the state's organization of the mass public. The ROK government systemically organized the entire nation under four categories: school, residential areas, social institutions, and workplaces. Even the armed forces were affiliated under the Armed Forces' Saemaŭl Movement. In each of the categories, the ROK government established "a strictly top-down, pyramidal cellular structure."[144] Thus, the establishment of the Yushin system ultimately transformed the entire nation into "a vast, densely woven web, from the tiniest family unit to the Saemaŭl Movement Headquarters in the Blue House."[145]

The establishment of the Yushin system enabled the ROK leadership to restructure the apparatus of the government into a garrison state or a quasi-wartime state.[146] With centralized and concentrated power, the ROK government was able to effectively mobilize resources for heavy and chemical industrialization. In this respect, the Yushin system can be characterized as a political success.[147] In addition, the ROK government's maximized capacity to penetrate into the domestic society of South Korea enabled it to silence social tension inherent in the state's rapid industrialization.[148] Thus, the state-led drive for heavy and chemical industrialization proceeded without any evident social resistance.

---

144 Ibid., 141.
145 Ibid.
146 Im, "The Origin of the Yushin Regime," 234; Kim, *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*, 140.
147 Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 235.
148 Ibid.

3.3. The ROK's Military Behaviors against the US Strategic Interests

3.3.1. ROK's Development of Missile Capability

From the perspective of South Korea, the US forces stationed in her territory signified the projection of military capability to deter North Korea.[149] The Nixon administration's reduction plan thus meant not only a weakening of the US commitment, but also a weakening of the American commitment to deter North Korea. In this respect, the leadership of South Korea needed to establish not only the state's ability to defend against a North Korean first strike, but also the ability to deter a North Korean attack.

South Korea tried to secure a deterrence capability by developing missile and nuclear capabilities throughout the 1970s. Washington pressured the ROK leadership to limit the scope of its missile capability, while providing technological assistance. The ROK's nuclear project during the 1970s was evidently not favored by the United States. The US made all-out efforts to dissuade the ROK from producing nuclear weapons, and succeeded in containing the ROK's independent steps toward nuclear weapons production. However, it was not able to completely dissuade the ROK from developing independent nuclear weapons capability.

The president's direction in December 1971 began the development of an independent missile system. Park was particularly concerned about the dangers of the DPRK's Frog missiles, which were forward-deployed near the DMZ. His concern was

---

[149] Ralph N. Clough, *Deterrence and Defense in Korea: The Role of U.S. Forces* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1976), 5-19.

that South Korea did not have any effective means to immediately counterattack Pyongyang. This led to the conclusion that the ROK had to acquire an independent capability to counterattack the capital of North Korea. He judged that South Korea could deter North Korea's initiation of war by establishing an independent missile capability to strike Pyongyang.[150]

According to the president's direction, the goal was to produce a surface-to-surface ballistic missile with a range of 200 kilometers (roughly 125 miles) at the initial stage, and to progressively expand the range in later stages. By September 1972, a group of scientists and engineers from several governmental agencies assembled a missile development plan that called for the successful testing of mid-range surface-to-surface missiles by the end of 1976 and long-range missiles by the end of 1979.[151] To virtually guarantee the state's financial support, Park designated the missile project as part of the *Yulgok Operation* to modernize ROK forces.[152] The ADD was the designated primary agency for the missile program. The missile development project started with a six-member study group within the ADD, which reviewed the feasibility of the project, and was expanded during the late 1970s to an ambitious project with 600 researchers.[153] The ADD concentrated its resources and actively sought to purchase required parts and components, propellant and guidance technologies from the international market, as well as to recruit a group of South Korean engineers and scientists from the United States.[154]

---

[150] Oh, *I am not Planning a War*, 418-19.
[151] These agencies included the ADD, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST), Korea Institute of Science and Technology (KIST), and Korea Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA).
[152] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 494.
[153] Seung-Young Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles: The South Korean Case, 1970–82." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 12, no. 4 (2001): 62.
[154] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 495-96.

To be sure, the development of surface-to-surface missile capability was made possible by US technology transfer.[155] This technological assistance, however, does not suggest that the US was fully supportive of the ROK's missile capability development. The US initially turned down the ROK government's request for an alternative missile system to develop surface-to-surface missile capability. Facing such opposition, Lee Hu Rak, director of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA), instructed the WEC to begin procurement of the Israeli-made Gabriel surface-to-surface missile, despite the Pentagon's objection that the missile system would endanger portions of the US military assistance program. The ROK military was also concerned that Washington would react negatively to the procurement plan.[156]

As the US Department of State concluded, the development of ROK's independent missile capability itself could destabilize the status quo in the Korean peninsula. Furthermore, Washington also came to regard the ROK's independent missile program as an integral part of South Korea's nuclear weapons programs during the 1970s.[157] Consequently, the US began to exercise direct pressure to control the ROK's missile

---

[155] During the initial stage, ADD learned basic missile design skills from MacDonnell-Douglas, which had manufactured the Nike-Hercules missile. The ADD was also able to acquire the required propellant technology through negotiation with Lockheed. See Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 495. The US military also transferred conventional warheads, electronics and conversion to surface-to-surface operation technology to South Korea during the 1970s. Regarding the US assistance, see Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 63.

[156] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 79.

[157] The Department of State suggested the following conclusion: "We believe that [ROK's surface-surface missile capability] … … could be destabilizing in the hands of the present ROK leadership and would risk serious and rapid escalation arising from the low-level naval and other incidents that are chronic between North and South Korea." In addition, it estimated that the linkage of the ROK's advanced missile capability with nuclear weapon development would have "the most serious strategic implications" in the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia. See US Department of State, "Sale of Rocket Propulsion Technology to South Korea," 4 February 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114634 (accessed April 25, 2016).

capability development as part of its all-out efforts to stop the nuclear weapons programs.[158] ADD's successful experiment with more advanced propulsion materials in 1976 led the US to pressure South Korea to cease its missile program.[159] The US also increased surveillance of South Korea as the ROK government continued its unilateral efforts to seek other international sources of assistance in developing missile capability and other conventional weapons.[160] In spite of this watchful observance however, the US did not have clear information on how advanced the ROK was in developing its missile capability until South Korea succeeded in its open test launch of the first Korean-produced surface-to-surface K-1 missile on September 26, 1978.[161] This new development led Washington to implement a chain of inspection tours in South Korea from November 1978 to June 1979, until US President Carter's visit to South Korea.

The ROK's leadership responded to the US pressure in two ways. On the one hand, the ROK government agreed to American demands to restrict its missile capability. The agreement between the US and ROK allowed the range of the Korean-made missiles to be 180 kilometers (112 miles) and the weight of warhead to be 1,000 pounds, while the Missile Technology Control Regime allowed the development of missiles with a range of

---

[158] The US Department of State suggested that the US should inhibit "to the fullest possible extent" any ROK development of a nuclear delivery system. See US National Security Council, "ROK Plans to Develop Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 3 March 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114628 (accessed April 25, 2016).

[159] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 63.

[160] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 496. The ROK's efforts to secure international assistance were recognized by international markets. For example, France singled out the ROK as a potential buyer of its entire stock of Honest John surface-to-surface missiles. The Humphrey-Glenn report in January 1978 also estimated the ROK's efforts as, "[ROK has] been discussing possible purchases of rifle grenades, antitank weapons, multiple rocket launchers, ship-to-ship missiles, air defense missiles, armored personnel carriers, and tanks with other governments." See Investigation of Korean-American Relations 1978, 81.

[161] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 68.

300 kilometers (187 miles) for military use.[162] South Korea agreed to the US demand to secure the US guiding technology and equipment, which were required to complete the surface-to-surface missile development.[163] On the other hand, President Park, after the open test launch of the Korean-made missile, encouraged the ADD to set up a long-term project to develop ballistic missiles with a range of 2,000 km, suggesting that Washington was not able to dissuade the ROK from developing an independent missile capability beyond the US-allowed scope.[164]

---

[162] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 510.
[163] Ibid., 496.
[164] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 68,

3.3.2. ROK's Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons during the 1970s

As the DOS estimated, the ROK's nuclear weapon program during the 1970s was the reflection of lessened confidence of the ROK government in US security commitment, and consequent desire on the part of South Korea to reduce its military dependence on the patron.[165] The ultimate goal of South Korea was to secure the state's future. ROK military leaders went through reviews of the state's security situation under the Nixon Doctrine and raised the option of the nuclear weapon development to deal with the North Korean military threats and US withdrawal of forces stationed in ROK. President Park made the final decision to go nuclear and inaugurated the WEC in the Blue House.[166] Park's commitment to the development of nuclear weapons capability stemmed from his awareness of ROK strategic vulnerability in the Korean peninsula that could not be reduced simply by increasing conventional military capabilities.[167] The WEC adopted by consensus the president's decision to pursue nuclear weapons capability.[168]

Following the president' decision, the ROK government expedited the acquisition of nuclear weapon-related technology. Because of its limited access to the sensitive materials needed to produce a nuclear weapon and the expected US opposition, the ROK tried to find the supplier of a facility to reprocess nuclear fuel other than the United States. For this purpose, Minister of Science and Technology Ch'oe Hyŏngsŏp visited

---

[165] US Department of State, Cable to the US Embassy in Seoul, "ROK Plans to Develop Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 4 March 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114616 (accessed April 25, 2016).
[166] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 58.
[167] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 503-4.
[168] Investigation of Korean-American Relations, 80.

France and Britain in 1972 to seek technological cooperation in building a reprocessing facility. In addition, members of the WEC visited other nuclear-capable countries such as Israel, Norway, and Switzerland in 1972. Additionally, the ROK sent a group of Korean scientists to India and Taiwan to consult on technical issues about the operation of the National Research Experimental (NRX) experimental reactor. These efforts were successful in procuring foreign assistance for ROK's nuclear project. By 1974, the ROK signed a contract with the French company, Saint Gobain Technique Nouvelle, for the purpose of acquiring the design of a nuclear reprocessing facility. In addition, ROK scientists secured the import of the NRX experimental reactor from France and Canada, which would enable South Korea to produce weapons-grade plutonium.[169]

The top-secret nuclear weapons program proceeded uninterrupted until the middle of 1974, when India's successful nuclear test led the United States to tighten monitoring on other potential challengers of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. It was against this background that the US embassy in Seoul learned of the ROK's nuclear weapons development.[170] In March 1975, Washington concluded that the ROK was proceeding with the initial phase of nuclear weapon development. From the US perspective, the ROK's nuclear weapons program had the potential to destabilize Northeast Asia and the Non-Proliferation system. The US Department of State emphasized the gravity of the issue as follows:

---

[169] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 58-9.
[170] US Embassy in Seoul, Cable from US Embassy in Seoul to US Department of State, "ROK Plans to Develop Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 11 December 1974, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114617 (accessed April 25, 2016).

> In the case of Korea, our general concerns [of nonproliferation] are intensified by its strategic location and by the impact which any Korean effort to establish nuclear capability would have on its neighbors, particularly North Korea and Japan. ROK possession of nuclear weapons would have [a] major destabilizing effect in an area in which not only Japan but USSR, PRC and ourselves are directly involved. It could lead to Soviet or Chinese assurances of nuclear weapons support to North Korea in the event of conflict. Further, ROK efforts to secure a nuclear weapon capability will inevitably impact on our bilateral security relationship.[171]

Washington was particularly concerned about South Korea potentially acquiring its own reprocessing capability. Once the ROK had direct access to separated plutonium, it would be widely regarded as either having nuclear weapons or acquiring them in a short period. This perception would potentially destabilize all of Northeast Asia. This concern led the Ford administration to conclude that "no special safeguards short of a complete prohibition on reprocessing and storage of plutonium in South Korea are likely to provide adequate protection against the most troublesome contingency."[172]

Despite the serious concern, Washington initially decided to tread gently to avoid a serious rift in the security relationship between the US and ROK. Kissinger instructed the US embassy in Seoul to have the ROK government ratify the NPT as a credible commitment to eschew the acquisition of nuclear weapons.[173] The Ford administration also introduced economic leverage to persuade South Korea to ratify the NPT. In March 1975, the US Congress suspended Export-Import Bank loans totaling $236 million to the nuclear energy industry of South Korea, stating that the ROK's timely ratification of the NPT would be an important factor in the Export-Import Bank eventually gaining

---

[171] US Department of State, "ROK Plans to Develop Nuclear Weapons and Missiles."
[172] US Department of State, "Approach to South Korea on Reprocessing," 2 July 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114620 (accessed April 25, 2016).
[173] US Department of State, "ROK Plans to Develop Nuclear Weapons and Missiles."

congressional approval to finance South Korea's civilian nuclear industry.[174] The veiled threat to block financial support convinced the ROK government to ratify the NPT in March 1975. The ratification of the NPT, however, did not reflect any real change in the ROK's nuclear behavior.

Washington's next step was to confront the ROK leadership about the reprocessing deal with France.[175] In July 1975, US Ambassador to the ROK Richard Sneider was instructed to deliver US opposition to the purchase of the reprocessing facility. Sneider took the case against the reprocessing deal "methodically up the chain of command" in order "not to confront [ROK president] Park and to allow him to save face."[176] The ambassador's efforts were closely coordinated with Washington. A series of increasing intense conversations were held between Philip Habib, the assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, and Hahm Pyong Choon, the ROK ambassador to the United States. Washington also created a number of incentives to offer in return for the ROK's cancellation of the French deal, including guaranteed access to reprocessing under US auspices for the civilian nuclear industry of South Korea, and access to additional US technology under a formal science and technology agreement.[177] The introduction of these positive inducements reflected the US expectation that the ROK government would seek positive gains in exchange for suspending its reprocessing deal with France.[178]

---

[174] Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 934.
[175] US Department of State, "ROK Nuclear Fuel Reprocessing Plans," 30 June 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114619 (accessed April 25, 2016).
[176] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 71.
[177] Ibid., 71-72.
[178]. US Embassy in Seoul, Telegram from US Embassy in Seoul to US Department of State, "ROK Nuclear Reprocessing," 16 December 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114608 (accessed April 25, 2016).

The introduction of carrots and sticks, however, was unable to stop the ROK's movement toward acquiring its own reprocessing capability.[179] This situation led Washington to employ "the heaviest threat ever wielded by the United States against South Korea."[180] It broadly threatened that the nuclear behavior would directly endanger the security relationship between the US and ROK. Ambassador Sneider delivered the US warning that the ROK's unwillingness to change its nuclear behavior would only "jeopardize availability of technology and largest financing capability which only the US could offer, as well as vital partnership with US, not only in nuclear and scientific areas but in broad political and security areas."[181] In his face-to-face talk with ROK President Park, Habib delivered Kissinger's message that the Washington would recalculate the entire alliance, including the withdrawal of the US commitment to nuclear umbrella.[182] The Ford administration also threatened to cut off $275 million in US annual military assistance to South Korea and cease its cooperation with the ROK in developing the civilian nuclear program.[183]

The threats from Washington led the ROK government to reverse its position on purchasing the French reprocessing facility.[184] A group of US officials then visited Seoul to negotiate the cancellation of the ROK reprocessing deal with France.[185] Following this

---

[179] US Embassy in Seoul, Telegram from US embassy in Seoul to US Department of State, "ROKG Nuclear Reprocessing," 31 October 1975, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114614 (accessed April 25, 2016).
[180] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 72.
[181] Ibid.
[182] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 66.
[183] Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 934-35.
[184] US Embassy in Seoul, Telegram from US Embassy in Seoul to US Department of State, "ROK Nuclear Reprocessing," 14 January 1976, http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114630 (accessed April 25, 2016).
[185] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 508.

visit, the ROK government reluctantly agreed to cancel the reprocessing deal in January 1976.[186]

The Ford Administration also persuaded Canada and France to revoke their offers of nuclear cooperation with South Korea. The Canadian government was willing to coordinate its policy with the US nonproliferation effort because it was already sensitive to the risk of nuclear proliferation following the success of India's nuclear test, and was facing domestic criticism for supplying the authoritarian South Korea with nuclear technology. France also agreed to suspend its assistance to the ROK government. In addition, the Belgonucleaire Company of Belgium cancelled its contract to introduce a plutonium reprocessing facility to the ROK. This series of blocks effectively frustrated the ROK's pursuit of nuclear weapons, because securing a facility to reprocess nuclear fuel was the greatest technological hurdle for South Korea.[187]

Despite the pressure from Washington, the ROK leadership's commitment to develop an independent nuclear capability continued. From the perspective of South Korea, the US-ROK agreement in January 1976 meant only the renunciation of its efforts to secure nuclear weapons technology through foreign assistance, not the renunciation of its right to develop nuclear weapons technologies through its own efforts.[188] The ROK's efforts to develop indigenous nuclear weapons reemerged as the notion of a phased reduction of US forces was revived in Jimmy Carter's campaign in June 1976. In the year

---

[186] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 73.
[187] Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 66.
[188] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 509.

after he entered office, Carter announced plans to withdraw almost all US troops and approximately 1,000 tactical nuclear weapons from South Korea.[189]

The ROK's renewed effort followed the Japanese model to become a potential nuclear developer.[190] In this respect, the nuclear project during the late 1970s focused more on the acquisition of nuclear materials and the development of indigenous nuclear technologies that would enable the future production of nuclear weapons, rather than an outright revival of the covert nuclear weapons program.[191] However, President Park also confidentially expressed the possibility of completing the development of a nuclear bomb by the first half of 1981, which indicates the military intention of the nuclear project.[192]

In December 1976, the ROK government established the Korean Nuclear Fuel Development Corporation (KNFDI), whose main task was to acquire reprocessing technology "indirectly through learning civilian nuclear technologies."[193] By October 1978, this government's agency constructed a nuclear fuel fabrication facility, which could be used to acquire spent nuclear fuel for producing weapons-grade plutonium.[194] Washington continued its surveillance of the ROK's nuclear project during the late 1970s, but could not find convincing evidence of a military intent for the project.[195]

---

189 Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 935.
190 Oh, *I am not Planning a War*, 430
191 Jonathan D Pollack. and Mitchell B. Reiss, "South Korea: The Tyranny of Geography and the Vexations of History." in *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices*, eds. Campbell, Kurt M. Campbell, Robert J. Einhorn, and Mitchell B. Reiss (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004), 263.
192 Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 73-4.
193 Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 509.
194 Ibid.
195 Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 935-36.

The ROK's nuclear project entirely changed after the assassination of President Park in October 1979. Park's successor Chun Doohwan suspended the weapons-related nuclear project and took definitive steps "to dismantle the ROK's nuclear weapons potential" to win US support for the new regime of South Korea, which was inaugurated in 1980.[196] In return, the Reagan administration promised to increase the US security and economic commitment to South Korea. At the same time, it threatened removing these benefits if the nuclear weapons project would continue.[197] With an eye to winning US support, the new regime also made a conspicuous effort to cripple the missile development program by carrying out two sharp reductions in the number the ADD researchers by 1982, which profoundly damaged the ROK's capability to develop long-range missiles.[198]

---

[196] Pollack and Reiss, "South Korea," 263.
[197] Michael J. Siler, "The U.S. Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy in the Northeast Asian Region During the Cold War: The South Korean Case," *East Asia* 16, no.3/4 (1998): 75-6.
[198] Hong, "The Search for Deterrence," 510; Kim, "Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles," 71.

3.4. Chapter Conclusion

The theory of this research expects to find co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of its efforts to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. Accordingly, a regional state is hypothesized to introduce huge-scale security-promoting drives when it is highly concerned about security in response to its patron's retrenchment. This research also suggests the existence of co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of military policies against the patron's strategic interests. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that a regional state is strongly committed to the pursuit of military policies against the patron's strategic interests when it is highly concerned about security.

This chapter finds that the Nixon administration's force withdrawal made the ROK leadership highly skeptical of the US security commitment. First, South Korea regarded the US force reduction plan as the weakening of the superpower's commitment to Korea. Second, the Nixon administration's redeployment of the 2nd Division away from the DMZ led to the leadership's belief that US would not rescue the ROK if North Korea invaded again. Third, Washington's mixed signals about the force reduction plan led to the leadership's loss of confidence in the patron's reliability. Fourth, South Korea came to be skeptical of the US reliability as a result of the Nixon administration's ambiguity and mixed signals about its military assistance for the modernization of the ROK forces. Last, the ROK's skepticism was deepened by the suspicion that Washington would reduce the US forces in Korea even further.

South Korea was also concerned about North Korea's revisionist behaviors. A series of the adversary's provocations in 1968 and the Johnson administration's conciliatory policy made the ROC leadership believe that the superpower's policy would lead North Korea to continue its revisionist behaviors. This belief led to the notion that the US force reduction policy would inevitably lead to the adversary's initiating a revisionist war.

The case study also finds that the ROK's threat perception of North Korea as a revisionist power did not change even under the development of détente in the Korean peninsula. Because of this threat perception, the ROK leadership believed that North Korea would even make use of the détente for its revisionist purpose. In addition, South Korea believed that the Sino-American rapprochement would negatively affect the ROK security. It was also concerned that the rapprochement would lead to further reduction of the US forces from Korea.

To summarize, the ROK leadership's assessment of threats was filtered through its perception of the US reliability. The leadership experienced high levels of threat from North Korea and this threat perception was magnified by its skepticism of the patron's commitment. Consequently, the level of the ROK's security concern was substantially high. According to the theory of this research, South Korea was hypothesized to make all-out efforts to promote domestic contribution to autonomous defense capability. The case study supports this hypothesis.

To begin with, the case study finds that the existence of strong leadership was behind the ROK government's efforts to promote domestic contribution to autonomous defense capability. President Park's guidance was apparently the driving force behind the development of defense industry. Park and his core policymakers also took initiative in

placing the heavy industrialization, which was the state's mobilization strategy to produce required defense materials through the development of targeted strategic industries. They decided which industries should be developed and introduced various policy instruments to financially support the development of the targeted strategic industries.

The imperative of security also made the ROK leadership introduce policy instruments to gain rapid access to domestic resources. For this purpose, the ROK government introduced the strategy of extraction to directly convert domestic financial resources into the state's defense capability. This included the compulsory National Defense Tax in 1975 and the National Investment Fund in 1973. These policy instruments facilitated South Korea's development of heavy industrialization projects as well as the increase in the overall defense capabilities of the ROK regular forces. In addition, the ROK's defense spending focused on increase in the state's defense capability.

The imperative of establishing autonomous defense capability required that the ROK leadership rapidly increase the development of the state's defense industry. This explains why the ROK government depended not only upon state-owned enterprises but also on big business in domestic market to increase in increasing defense capabilities. The urgency of security made ROK leadership prioritize security over economic rationale. Thus the ROK policymakers constrained market rationality in favor of promoting the targeted strategic industries, harnessing domestic and international market forces where necessary for security purposes. As a result, during the 1970s, the state's defense industry and was almost completely insulated from market pressure and even insured from failure through government subsides.

Finally, the ROK leadership established a societal base of autonomous defense capability. This began with the introduction of the Saemaŭl Movement, which justified the state's push for the heavy industrialization. It also introduced a series of political measures to secure societal support for the industrialization project. Furthermore, the establishment of the Yushin system made it possible for the ROK regime to maximize its capacity to penetrate into domestic society. Thus the ROK leadership was able to silence social tension inherent in the state's rapid industrialization. As a result of these domestic drives, the ROK regime established a garrison state in South Korea, strengthening government control over domestic society.

It is also hypothesized that South Korea was strongly committed to the pursuit of military policies against the strategic interests of the United States. This hypothesis is supported by this case study. The ROK government tried to develop a missile capability, even beyond the scope allowed by the United State. This military behavior was against the US strategic interests to establish the status-quo in the Korean peninsula. The ROK leadership also developed an independent nuclear weapon capability, which evidently jeopardized the superpower's interests of nonproliferation. The imperative of security was the driving force of the ROK's military behaviors against the patron's strategic interests. According to the theory of this research, they can be characterized as the ROK leadership's strategy to pressure upon the United States to reverse its objectionable strategic posture in East Asia. The leadership was so much committed to the pursuit of missile and nuclear weapons programs that it was unwilling to abandon them even under Washington's pressure.

CHAPTER 4. CASE STUDY OF TAIWAN

4.1. The ROC Leadership's Perception of Security

4.1.1. The Taiwan Issue between Washington and Beijing

After losing the Chinese Civil War, Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalist Party Kuomintang retreated to the island of Taiwan in 1949 and established the Republic of China (ROC).[1] In his stead, Mao Zedong and his Chinese Community Party (CCP) seized power over mainland China and founded the People's Republic of China (PRC) in October 1949. Following the experience that the US military retrenchment from South Korea led to the communist invasion of South Korea in 1950, Washington decided to secure Taiwan from invasion by communist China. This led to the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China in 1954.

US could have improved relations with the PRC during the 1950s, as the American public had more or less accepted the CCP's control over mainland China.[2] But a central problem was that Washington could not weaken the US commitment to Taiwan. Eisenhower's "New Look" Doctrine, which emphasized the notion of nuclear deterrence,

---

[1] In this case study, the term the ROC and Taiwan are used interchangeably for stylistic purposes. But the present study also uses the term Taiwan to refer to the island of Taiwan, if necessary.
[2] Christensen, *Useful Adversaries*, 194.

made the US's reputation for resolve even more central to its strategy. Accordingly, Taiwan became important to the US's grand strategy during the early stages of the Cold War confrontation in East Asia. The US commitment to Taiwan, coupled with communist China's strategy of confrontation, led to a constant dispute between Washington and Beijing until the Nixon administration changed the direction of US policy toward communist China.[3]

Nixon built his career as a politician by advocating the US security commitment to Taiwan.[4] However, this commitment dampened as he gained more foreign policy experience. He came to disagree with Chiang Kai-shek when the ROC president argued that the only way to defeat the Communist threats was with bullets. Indeed, Nixon remarked, "Chiang was a friend and unquestionably one of the giants of the twentieth century. I wondered whether he might be right, but my pragmatic analysis told me he was wrong."[5] He also reoriented his commitment to the Cold War confrontation. This laid the basis for Nixon's *Foreign Affairs* article in 1967 calling for an end to China's isolation.[6]

Nixon's strategy in East Asia was to minimize conflict with Beijing in order to better exploit Sino-Soviet tensions. However, he was not prepared to sacrifice Taiwan because

---

[3] Ibid., 195.

[4] He began his career in the late 1940s attacking Truman's abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek and his anti-Communist Nationalists. In addition, while serving as the vice president, Nixon had frequent contact with the Nationalist leaders, communicating with them on both ideological and strategic levels. During his presidential campaign against John F. Kennedy, he also expressed commitment to the protection of the ROC's seat in the United Nations. See John W. Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance: Nationalist China and American Cold War Strategy in Asia* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1997), 266; Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable? Nixon and Kissinger Go to China," *The Journal of American History* 92, no.1 (2005): 116-17.

[5] Richard M. Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1978), 282.

[6] Richard M. Nixon, "Asia after Vietnam." *Foreign Affairs* 46, no.1 (1967): 111-25.

US credibility as a security guarantee weighed heavily in his China policy.[7] He was convinced that the abandoning Taiwan would deeply damage the United States' credibility in the eyes of its regional allies in East Asia. In addition, he believed that sacrificing Taiwan was not necessary to achieve the normalization of relations with the PRC, because he was convinced that Beijing was not deeply concerned with Taiwan. Nixon acknowledged that Beijing would push Washington to recognize the PRC's sovereignty over Taiwan and withdraw US military protection from the island. But he also believed that the US-PRC cooperation in dealing with the Soviet Union could lead to agreement on the Taiwan issues that would be acceptable to the United States.[8]

Following the president's initiative in reorienting US policy toward China, Kissinger introduced the notion of the strategic triangle among the US, the USSR, and the PRC. As a national security advisor to the president, he thought that the United States could play the PRC and the Soviet Union each against the other.[9] By giving importance to Beijing in the US global strategy, however, Kissinger simply dismissed Taiwan as inconsequential.[10] Thus, Kissinger's approach raised the question of whether Taiwan would be sacrificed on the altar of great-power politics.

Nixon and Kissinger did not realize the importance the PRC leadership attached to the issue of Taiwan. Rather they regarded Taiwan as merely one of several impediments in the relationship between China and the United States.[11] However, the communist

---

[7] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 265.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Lowell Dittmer, "The Strategic Triangle: An Elementary Game-Theoretical Analysis," *World Politics* 3, no. 4 (1981): 485-515.
[10] Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable," 117.
[11] Nixon and Kissinger believed that the main issues between the US and the PRC were the following. First, the Nixon administration assumed that the main challenge for both sides would be to manage and

leadership made it known from the first tentative contacts in 1970 that the recovery of its sovereignty over Taiwan should be a precondition for any improvement of relations between Washington and Beijing.[12] Nixon believed that Beijing's claim over Taiwan was simply ritual, targeted at protecting the policy of opening relationship with America from criticism within the Chinese leadership.[13]

When Kissinger paid a secret visit to Beijing in July 1971, he realized that the PRC leadership was still preoccupied with Taiwan.[14] Zhou En-lai, the PRC premier, indicated that there would be no reconciliation without settlement on Taiwan. He asserted without hesitation that "The U.S. must recognize that the PRC is the sole legitimate government in China and that Taiwan Province is an inalienable part of Chinese territory which must be restored to the motherland." Zhou also demanded withdrawal of the US military forces and facilities from Taiwan within a limited period.[15] To justify such demands, he referred to Dean Acheson's White Paper, which mentioned that "It was the Chinese people themselves who won their own liberation, who liberated our motherland, and drove away the reactionary rule of the Chiang Kai-shek clique." He also referred to the Truman administration's statement that "It had no territorial ambitions regarding Taiwan or any

---

improve their relationship within the context of their mutual fear of the Soviet Union. Second, Nixon and Kissinger regarded Vietnam as an obstacle to a better relationship between the US and China but as one that was in the process of being removed. See Margaret Macmillan. *Nixon and Mao: The Week That Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2007), 245-47.

12 Ibid, 256.

13 Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 270.

14 For Beijing, the Taiwan issue involved the completion of China's "national liberation." It is also significant in terms of communist China's domestic politics because Taiwan was a core issue that had fueled Chinese patriotism. In this respect, the communist leadership feared that Washington would ask Beijing to make concessions on the Taiwan issue. See Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 269.

15 FRUS China 1969-1972, 368-69.

other Chinese territories," and that "It wouldn't interfere in China's internal affairs and would leave the Chinese people to settle internal questions."[16]

In response, Kissinger promised that the US would set a firm timetable to remove two-thirds of its forces from Taiwan, which were there only because of the Vietnam War, once the US had found a way to make peace in Vietnam. He also indicated that the other third of the forces would be removed as relations between US and China improved.[17] On the other hand, he rejected Zhou's demand that US renounce ties with Taiwan. He also rejected the premier's assertion that the purpose of Nixon's visit to China should be to discuss the Taiwan issue as a prelude to normalization of relations.[18]

As Kissinger recalled, the series of meetings during his visit to Beijing was dominated by "the tension between the Chinese thrust for clarity and ours for ambiguity" regarding Taiwan.[19] Chou sought clarity, while Kissinger tried to remain ambiguous regarding the Chinese claim of sovereignty over Taiwan.[20] Kissinger was vague about the fate of the US-Taiwan defense treaty, remaining tied to the formalities of a decaying US-Taiwan mutual security treaty, which was still indispensable to Taiwan.[21]

Nixon's visit to China in February 1972 was a chance for Washington and Beijing to confirm the understanding reached by Kissinger and Zhou during the previous year. As the president put it, "Taiwan was the touchstone for both sides" during his meetings with the Chinese leaders. Nixon was "committed to Taiwan's right to exist as an independent

---

16 Ibid., 366.
17 Ibid., 369.
18 Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 270-71.
19 FRUS China 1969-1972, 536.
20 Macmillan, *Nixon and Mao*, 259.
21 Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable," 134.

nation," while the Chinese leaders "were equally determined to use the communique to assert their unequivocal claim to the island."[22] Beijing pushed for U.S. commitment to total and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from the island. In response, Nixon insisted on linking the withdrawal of forces to a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan problem.[23]

The two sides issued the Shanghai Communique, in which they agreed that "The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Straits maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a province of China. The United States Government does not challenge that position; it hopes that the settlement of the Taiwan question consistent with this position will be achieved through peaceful negotiations and states that it will progressively reduce and finally withdraw all the U.S. troops and military installations from Taiwan."[24] This statement suggests that Washington promised not to challenge Beijing's position that Taiwan was a part of China and not to support Taiwan's independence. From Washington's perspective, the key compromise on Taiwan was the US promise to withdraw all of its military forces and installations from the island in return for Beijing's commitment to a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan issue. But the compromise was formulated in such a way that both sides avoided addressing in specific terms the termination of the US security commitment to Taiwan. Beijing did not press Washington on the termination of the US-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty, and the US did

---

[22] Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, 570.
[23] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 272-73.
[24] FRUS China 1969-1972, 569.

not press the PRC for an explicit commitment to peaceful resolution of the issues surrounding Taiwan.[25]

4.1.2. Taiwan's Assessment of US Reliability

The ROC leadership expressed doubts about the reliability of the US security commitment to Taiwan. In his memoir, James Shen, who served as the ROC's last ambassador to the United States, mentioned three points to support his argument that Washington betrayed Taiwan during the 1970s.[26] First, he maintained that Washington did not consult with Taiwan in advance regarding the reorientation in US policy toward communist China. Second, he pointed out that the US gave up its security commitment to Taiwan and decided to terminate the mutual defense treaty between the US and Taiwan. Third, he maintained that Washington did not do all it could do, or all it had promised to do, to keep the ROC's representation in the UN. The three points help to interpret how the ROC leadership evaluated the patron reliability.

Washington did have reasons not to inform the ROC of the intentions and plans in its new China policy. As Kissinger remarked, "It is a tragedy that it has to happen to Chiang [Kai-shek] at the end of his life. But we have to be cold about it."[27] An internal document explained the US position in detail: "Telling the ROC frankly about our long-term plans has both advantages and disadvantages. By informing Premier Chiang Ching-

---

[25] "Normalization of U.S.-PRC Relations and the Future of Taiwan," Undated, China and the United States 1960-1998.
[26] James C. H. Shen, *The U.S. & Free China: How the U.S. Sold Out Its Ally* (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1984).
[27] Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable," 125.

kuo [son and successor of Chiang Kai-shek] we could give him time to make internal adjustments on Taiwan so that his own position is not endangered, and stability is not undermined, when we make our move. Also, we would have an opportunity to influence the ROC's reaction. On the other hand, this would be risky because the ROC could decide to take countermeasures to try to forestall what we plan to do. They could leak our intentions publicly to try to stimulate a debate within the U.S. Government and public."[28] Washington's ambiguity, however, led the ROC to suspect that questions related to Taiwan were being discussed behind its back.[29]

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Chiang Kai-shek and his core policy advisers believed that the United States had no alternative but to support the ROC. At the same time, they came to fear that Washington might abandon Taiwan or compel its leadership to adopt conciliatory policies toward China.[30] Taiwan reiterated its opposition to all official contact between Washington and Beijing, by way of official statements and diplomatic protest. In particular, Taiwan criticized the voices calling for the US to reorient its policy of containing communist China.[31]

In this respect, it was no wonder that Taipei was alarmed by the first tentative contact between the US and the PRC, the February 1970 Warsaw meeting. In particular, what concerned the ROC leadership about the meeting was the fact that Washington did not inform Taipei in advance of what the US planned to discuss at its talks with the PRC. Moreover, Washington gave only evasive replies when ROC representatives subsequently

---

[28] "People's Republic of China," Undated, China and the United States 1960-1998.
[29] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 267-68.
[30] Ibid., 84-8.
[31] Ibid., 266.

asked for a briefing on the talks. The ROC response suggests that what concerned Taiwan about US reliability as a security provider was the secrecy in the Nixon administration's policy toward China. This secrecy resulted in lack of prior consultation between Washington and Taipei, thus depriving the ROC leadership of a clear sense of the US commitment to Taiwan.[32]

After the Warsaw meeting, Taiwan's primary concern was whether Washington was prepared to make any concessions to Beijing on Taiwan in order to improve relations with China. To gauge Nixon's intentions on Taiwan in the context of the new China policy, Chiang Ching-kuo visited Washington in April 1970. He asked whether Washington intended to reach some sort of nonaggression agreement or peaceful coexistence with Beijing. Such an agreement, he believed, would be tantamount to Washington's recognizing Beijing as the legitimate government of the Chinese mainland. He also wanted to know whether Washington still intended to support Taiwan in the event of another attack from the PRC.[33]

After the trip to Washington, however, Chiang came to believe that relations between the United States and Taiwan would soon change decisively. He was certain that Nixon would undermine the US's commitment to recognizing the ROC as the only legitimate government of China, fatally challenging its international status, and thereby drastically weakening the legitimacy of the Chinese Nationalist Party in Taiwan.[34]

---

[32] As Ralph Clough recalled, "We kept Chiang Kai-shek generally informed, but, of course, he wasn't confident that we were telling him everything." Quoted in Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable," 118.
[33] Shen, *The U.S. & Free China*, 48-54,
[34] Jay Taylor, *The Generalissimo's Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the Revolutions in China and Taiwan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 296-300.

Taiwan's concern about US reliability was also expressed in James Shen's conversations with US policymakers. In his first meeting with Nixon, Shen was told that the US would continue to honor its obligation under the mutual defense treaty and would continue to support the ROC's membership in the UN.[35] But he soon learned of Kissinger's secret visit to Beijing in July 1971, shortly after assuming his post as the ROC ambassador to the United States. He lodged a strong protest and expressed profound regret, describing the US approach toward the PRC as "hardly be described as a friendly act."[36] He also stressed how "indignant," "bewildered, and "shocked" Taiwan was by the US's opening to Communist China. Then he asked, "Where is all this going to end?"[37] This statement pointed to Taiwan's underlying fear of abandonment by the US.

After Nixon's visit to Beijing, Shen raised three points about the Shanghai Communique to the US president.[38] First, he criticized the Communique for omitting any reference to the US defense commitment to Taiwan. Second, he asked why the US said that it would not challenge Beijing's claim to sovereignty over Taiwan. Third, he asked about the Communique's reference to the withdrawal of US forces and military installations from Taiwan. Later, Shen also raised the question of how the US would maintain the defense treaty with Taiwan once it recognized the PRC as the sole legitimate government of China.[39] Behind the question lay the fear that recognition of the PRC as the sole legal government of China would lead to the withdrawal of legal recognition of the ROC government in Taiwan, which would eventually lead to the automatic lapse of

---

35 Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 268.
36 FRUS China 1969-1972, 456.
37 Shen, *The U.S. & Free China*, 72.
38 FRUS China 1969-1972, 825-830.
39 FRUS China 1973-1976, 446.

the 1954 Mutual Defense Treaty.[40] These question altogether show that the ROC leadership was deeply suspicious that Nixon and Kissinger had sacrificed Taiwan on the altar of great power politics.

4.1.3. Taiwan's Expulsion from the United Nations

The ROC's representation of China in the UN was another issue that Washington needed to deal with, even though it was not a key matter of contention between Washington and Beijing. Throughout the 1950s, the US had been able to mobilize a majority in the UN General Assembly to prevent any challenge of the ROC's membership in the UN. But the entry of several newly independent nations into the UN during the 1960s resulted in a steady increase in pressure for the UN to admit the PRC. In dealing with this situation, the Nixon administration suggested a dual-representation formula that would place both the PRC and the ROC in the UN.[41] But Washington also feared that the dual representation plan might induce Beijing to abort the incipient Sino-American rapprochement.[42]

As a founding member of the United Nations, the ROC clung to the doctrine that its presence in the General Assembly and the Security Council must remain inseparable and indivisible. Thus, it could not accommodate the realities of the PRC's growing international prominence. Nor did Taipei cooperate with Washington on the outcome of

---

[40] "Normalization of U.S.-PRC Relations and the Future of Taiwan," Undated, China and the United States 1960-1998.
[41] Tucker, "Taiwan Expendable," 127-28.
[42] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 251.

the 1971 debate in the General Assembly on who should represent China in the United Nation.[43] The UN General Assembly ended up passing the Albanian resolution, which recognized the PRC as the only lawful representative of China to the UN. As a result of this decision in October 1971, the PRC took over Taiwan's membership in the UN, expelling it from the organization.

In his memoir, Shen referred to the April 1971 talks between Chiang Kai-shek and Robert D. Murphy, a personal representative to President Nixon, to support his argument that Washington did not do all it had promised to keep the ROC in the UN.[44] Murphy proposed that both the PRC and the ROC have seats in the UN General Assembly and that the latter maintain China's seat in the Security Council. Chiang agreed to the proposal on the condition that the US promise not to sponsor the PRC's admittance to the UN and that it attempt to rally a majority against admitting the PRC to the UN.[45] Shen reiterated Chiang's demand when he traveled to Washington to become the ROC's ambassador to the United States. During the 1971 UN debate, however, Washington did not explicitly suggest whether the ROC or the PRC should hold China's permanent seat in the UN Security Council. Rather, the Nixon administration gave the impression that it was prepared to allow this question to be decided by the UN General Assembly. Taipei regarded this position as a betrayal of the US pledge conveyed during the Murphy-Chiang talks.[46]

---

[43] Ibid., 259-62.
[44] Shen, *The U.S. & Free China*, 64.
[45] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969–1976. Volume V. United Nations, 1969–1972. Document 349.
[46] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 252-53.

To be sure, the imperative of normalizing relations with the PRC caused Washington to abstain from using all leverage to influence the 1971 UN debate on the membership of the two Chinas.[47] Faced with US hesitance, Taiwan came to believe that the US-PRC rapprochement severely undermined the ROC's battle to maintain its membership in the UN. In this respect, Shen criticized Kissinger's presence in Beijing in October 1971 for a second round of discussions with the communist leadership, just when the UN General Assembly was debating the ROC's membership in the UN.[48] Taipei believed that Washington defaulted on its promise to use US veto power to fight communist China's representation in the UN. It also believed that Washington did not try enough to modify the process of US-PRC rapprochement to gain an advantage for the ROC in the debate about China's representation in the UN.[49]

4.1.4. Taiwan's Assessment of the PRC's Threats

This study argues that a state's security concern is a function of its assessment of its patron's reliability and of military threats from its adversaries. The previous section suggests that ROC leadership, faced with the developing rapprochement between Washington and Beijing and the ROC's possible expulsion from the United Nations, came to be skeptical of US reliability. So the next question is how Taiwan assessed the PRC's threats during the 1970s.

---

[47] Regarding this point, see Richard Moorsteen and Morton Abramowitz, *Remaking China Policy: U.S.-China Relations and Governmental Decisionmaking* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 15-6.
[48] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 260.
[49] Ibid., 248-63.

The development of Sino-American rapprochement caused concern among the ROC leadership that Beijing "would aim its major efforts at extracting U.S. concessions on Taiwan."[50] In addition, the declining US support for South Vietnam caused Taiwan to believe that it would be compromised next. As Shen remarked, "The betrayal of South Vietnam gave the Republic of China a breathing spell. People high in [the] U.S. government were overheard to say that 'Selling one ally down the river was quite enough for one year without abandoning another – the Republic of China.'"[51] The declining belief in US reliability led to the widespread fear that the US intended to achieve a "decent interval" between the termination of the US-Taiwan defense treaty and the eventual conquest of Taiwan by the People's Liberation Army (PLA) of China.[52] Behind the fear was the threat that communist China would use the Sino-American rapprochement as an opportunity to realize its revisionist purpose.

The development of Sino-American rapprochement led the PRC leadership to advance the notion of Taiwan's "liberation" by mainland China. As Washington assessed, it was Beijing's anticipation of rapid Sino-US normalization that caused the PRC to launch a peace offensive toward Taiwan. Beijing tried to induce talks with Taipei and initiate a process whereby peaceful reunification could be achieved. However, the communist leadership was pessimistic about the prospects for normalization, leading the PRC to overtly express its readiness to liberate Taiwan militarily from the ruling Kuomintang regime. As a result, Beijing introduced a harder line toward Taiwan.[53]

---

[50] FRUS China 1969-1972, 586.
[51] Shen, *The U.S. & Free China*, 13.
[52] Garver, *The Sino-American Alliance*, 248-49.
[53] US Department of State. "Peking's Hard Line on Taiwan," 4 October 1976, China and the United States 1960-1998.

Thus, a remaining issue was whether Beijing would try to incorporate Taiwan using military force. Washington's assessment was that PRC leadership would not try to achieve its aspiration for political dominance in Asia by military conquest. While recognizing the PRC's ability to launch a major arms attack against any of its neighbors, US policymakers did not find any evidence of the PRC's intent to expand its borders or pursue it objectives by military might.[54] Rather, Washington concluded that Beijing would find it difficult to introduce an offensive military strategy because of the PRC leadership's awareness of the state's vulnerability, the presence of a defense-oriented doctrine, and the limited technical basis for the development of offensive military capabilities.[55] Furthermore, US policymakers advanced the argument that the Sino-Soviet confrontation would make it difficult for the PRC leadership to allocate resources toward offensive capabilities.[56] The US assessment suggests that Washington was skeptical that the PRC would introduce an offensive strategy to take over Taiwan militarily.

It should be noted that ROC leadership came to agree with Washington's assessment that Sino-Soviet confrontation would constrain China from pursuing an offensive military campaign against Taiwan. For example, Shen said that he did not find the absence of the PRC's military operation against Taiwan "unduly surprising, with the Chinese Communists having the Russians on their back."[57] He reiterated this agreement by saying that "Peking would not be able to pull off such a military campaign, particularly in

---

54 FRUS China 1969-1972, 58.
55 Ibid., 1017-23.
56 FRUS China 1973-1976, Document. 88.
57 FRUS China 1969-1972, 590.

[the] light of Soviet pressure from the north."[58] In addition, the ROC leadership, while accepting the inevitability of a growing superiority of the PRC's military capability and the reduction in the level of US military presence in Taiwan, concluded that the PRC would expend its efforts in maintaining détente with the US rather than pursuing the assimilation of the ROC.[59]

The ROC leadership's concern about the PRC's strategy to isolate Taiwan led it to emphasize the importance of establishing its viability for survival. Considering the psychological importance the ROC leadership attached to UN membership, it was no wonder Taiwan believed that its expulsion from the organization undermined its international status and prospects for survival.[60] As the ROC's Vice Foreign Minister Yang Hsi-kun pointed out, withdrawal from UN would mean "eventual political suicide" for Taiwan, because "The increasing isolation that the Chinese Communists can force on the GRC from their improved position within the UN will mean the rapidly increasing besiegement and eventual strangulation of the GROC [Government of the Republic of China] unless drastic change is undertaken immediately."[61]

The examination of the ROC's threat assessment suggests that Taiwan' security arrangement was of a different nature from that of South Korea. The case study of South Korea shows that the South Korean leadership continued to be concerned about the revisionist military strategy of North Korea as well as the reliability of the US security commitment. This explains why the level of the ROC's security concern was

---

[58] Ibid., 830.
[59] US National Security Council, "NSSM 212: U.S. Security Assistance to the Republic of China," 12 November 1974, China and the United States 1960-1998.
[60] FRUS China 1969-1972, 351.
[61] Ibid., 599.

substantially high. In comparison, Taiwan's assessment of the PRC's threats shows that it was not concerned about military threats from mainland China, but it still doubted the reliability of the US security commitment to Taiwan. In this respect, it can be said that the ROC was relatively less concerned about security than South Korea.

The comparison between South Korea and Taiwan suggests that the two states differ in terms of their respective state leaderships' preference for short-term military preparedness over relatively longer-term objectives, such as economic growth and political stability.[62] In the case of South Korea, the leadership's belief about the imminence of military threats from North Korea led it to first maximize the state's military security in the short term, even though doing so had negative long-term repercussion for the state's other objectives. In comparison, the absence of direct military threats from communist China suggests that the ROC leadership was not under pressure to prioritize short-term military preparedness over the state's relatively longer-term objectives. Rather, it can be argued that the emphasis on sustainability led the ROC leadership to try to achieve Taiwan's military preparedness and other state objectives in a balanced way.[63]

---

[62] This point refers to Brooks' criticism of the neorealism regarding the "degree to which states favor immediate military preparedness over" their relatively longer-term objectives. While criticizing this neorealist viewpoint that military preparedness always trumps other, longer-term objectives, he suggests that one needs to examine the nature of a state's preference in studying its decision to choose short-term military preparedness over other objectives. This leads to the suggestion that, given the absence of immediate security competition, rational policymakers may try to balance between immediate military preparedness and longer-term objectives. See Brooks, "Dueling Realisms," 446-53.

[63] In this respect, US policymakers assessed that Taiwan's economic growth and political stability made it extremely difficult for Beijing to assimilate Taiwan by political means. See US Department of State, "Preparation for Secretary's Visit," 6 October 1973, China and the United States 1960-1998; US Department of State, "Taiwan in US-PRC Relations," 23 October 1973, China and the United States 1960-1998.

4.2. Taiwan's Security-Promoting Domestic Drives in the 1970s

4.2.1. Development of the Defense Industry in Taiwan

The Nixon administration's military retrenchment in the periphery of China, coupled with the decline in US military equipment grants to Taiwan, posed a question of national security for the ROC leadership. The Nixon administration continued to provide Taiwan with a reliable and adequate supply of military assistance for its security.[64] But the Sino-American rapprochement led Taiwan to feel "apprehension about what the future might hold that led to the search for alternatives" to the US military protection of Taiwan.[65] This was the background against which the ROC leadership introduced domestic drives for an autonomous defensive capability.

The ROC leadership's motive behind the development of Taiwan's defense industry was providing for its own security. During the 1950s, the ROC government was left with only limited weapon production capabilities. Thus Taiwan largely depended upon the US air and naval forces for defense.[66] Following the termination of US economic assistance in 1965, the ROC government started to establish its own defense-industrial base.[67] However, the ROC leadership did not make a serious attempt to expand the state's defense industry until the late 1960s, because of the financial burdens and the reluctance of the Kuomintang leadership to believe that their stay on the island was permanent.[68]

---

[64] US National Security Council, "NSSM 212: U.S. Security Assistance to the Republic of China," 12 November 1974, China and the United States 1960-1998.
[65] Lewis Sorely, *Arms Transfers under Nixon* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1983), 169.
[66] Ralph N. Clough, *Island China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 106.
[67] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 47-8.
[68] Lewis Reese Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies* (Ph.D.diss. Columbia

In particular, the Kuomintang's commitment to keeping a large contingent of ground forces prevented Taiwan from developing a viable defense industry. The presence of a large ground force represented the ROC leadership's ambition to retake the Chinese mainland militarily.[69] President Chiang Kai-shek was at the core of the group that championed the dream of a triumphant return to mainland China.[70] As the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, Chiang was the only apparent link between the state and the military. This meant that the government lacked any authority for determining expenditure on the ground forces.[71]

The absence of institutional constraint led the ROC government to unnecessarily allocate a huge portion of national budget to the maintenance of ground forces. For example, more than 90 percent of the central government's budget was consumed by military expenditure in 1950. This declined by only ten per cent during the early 1950s. As a result, by the end of the decade, Taiwan's military burden became one of the largest outside the Communist bloc. The Kuomintang regime tried to increase military expenditure even further during the 1960s.[72]

However, the offensive strategy could no longer be sustained after the Kuomintang regime's last unsuccessful attempt in 1967 to enlist Washington's support for an attack against the mainland. The ROC leadership did not have any choice but to accept the inevitable budgetary realities of financing a large conventional ground force with

---

University, 1993), 358.
[69] Clough, *Island China*, 105.
[70] Cha, "Powerplay," 169.
[71] Bernard D. Cole, *Taiwan's Security: History and Prospects* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 91.
[72] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 92-5.

diminishing resources.[73] In addition, US retrenchment posed a question of national security and demanded an alternative to the US military protection. As a result, the ROC government increased an indigenous capacity for defense material production. Taiwan's defense industry matured to such an extent that, by 1980, it was estimated to be able to produce most defense materials, which included ammunition, combat aircraft, military vehicles, modern fighter aircraft, overhauling warships, tactical communication equipment, air-to-air missiles, and surface-to-surface missiles.[74]

To begin with, US licensing arrangements helped Taiwan develop the capability for weapons production for ground forces.[75] With US sponsorship, the ROC government developed the capability to produce M-14 and M-16 rifles, M-60 machines guns, four calibers of mortars, and two types of recoilless rifles. Taiwan also developed capacity for artillery production, which led to the production of 125 mm multiple-tube rocket launchers, 3.5 inch and 66mm rocket launchers, and 100mm and 155 mm howitzers.

The ROC government also made efforts to increase indigenous capacity for naval production.[76] In the early 1970s, Taiwan built 30-ton patron boats, which were the first navel craft produced indigenously. Then, in 1975, the ROC government signed a contract with Tacoma Boat, a US defense industry, to produce a series of Multi-Mission Patrol Ships under the aegis of China Shipbuilding, a state-owned enterprise of Taiwan. Taiwan also contracted with Westinghouse to produce frigates.

---

[73] Ibid., 278.
[74] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), *World Armaments and Disarmament: SIPRI Yearbook* (Taylor & Francis, 1981), 81.
[75] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 61.
[76] Ibid., 59-60.

The development of ROC's capacity for aircraft production was also done primarily through the government's licensed production arrangement with US defense industries. For example, Taiwan signed a licensed agreement with Bell Helicopter Company in 1969 to jointly manufacture military helicopters. According to this offset agreement, Taiwan built a factory to co-produce the military helicopters.[77] Offset arrangements between the ROC government and US defense industries grew so rapidly throughout the 1970s that, by the mid-1970s, Taiwan was able to shift from direct import of defense materials to licensed production of much of its military equipment.[78] Furthermore, Taiwan produced two-thirds of its defense materials by the end of the 1970s, as a result of the government's efforts to accelerate import substitution.[79]

The ROC's efforts to produce aircraft should be noted. According to the Nixon administration's military retrenchment in Taiwan, Washington decided to withdraw two squadrons of F-4 fighters, the most significant part of the US forces on Taiwan, by the end of 1974.[80] This stimulated the ROC government to sign an agreement with Northrup Grumman for a joint venture production of the F-5E Tiger II fighter.[81] The F-5E program was the "centerpiece of Taiwan's defense industrialization efforts," and was "certainly its most significant military project," because it provided an important edge of superiority to the PRC fighters, at least from a qualitative standpoint.[82]

---

77 Alice H. Amsden, "The State and Taiwan's Economic Development," in *Bringing the State Back In*, eds. Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 99.
78 SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook* (Taylor & Francis, 1975), 197.
79 James A. Gregor, "Republic of China." in *Arms Production in Developing Countries*, ed. James E. Katz (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1984), 312.
80 FRUS China 1973-1976, 466-67.
81 Gregor, "Republic of China," 307.
82 Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 54.

4.2.2. Establishment of a Centralized Decision-Making Process

The ROC government's efforts to promote a domestic contribution to an autonomous defensive capability began with the state's establishment of a highly centralized decision-making process to orchestrate the process. The ROC government came to recognize that economic and security policy were becoming increasingly interdependent. As a result, the decision-making process was arranged according to the following line of reasoning:

> Decisions in matters of economic development must … … be analyzed simultaneously for their contribution to the military security of the state. At the same time, military decisions whether or not to produce a given weapon system indigenously, to purchase it ready-made, or to forgo it altogether must be looked at from the point of view of their contribution to the economic health of the state.[83]

Taiwan established the state's decision-making structure in such a way as to encompass an economic or even social agenda in establishing defensive capability. The National Security Council (NSC), which was established in 1967, took the primary role in orchestrating the overall process. The NSC was a consultative body made up of the Kuomintang regime's military, political, and administrative elites and became the de facto governing body, subordinating the executive, legislative, and judiciary branches along with other state bodies. Under President Chiang's initiative, the NSC was able to circumvent bureaucratic and sectoral rivalries within the decision process and achieve an integrated agenda for the development of defense capabilities. As a result, any policy

---

[83] Ibid., 87.

objectives related to developing the state's indigenous defense capabilities fell within the NSC's purview.[84]

In addition, between 1969 and 1972, the ROC government created a series of ad hoc committees to formulate and execute policy according to the NSC's guidelines. These committees included the Budget Inquiry Committee; the Commission on Taxation Reform; the Financial, Economic and Monetary Conference (FEMC); and the Council of International Economic Cooperation and Development (CIECD). The committees were responsible for directing domestic resources toward the establishment of Taiwan's autonomous defensive capability during the 1970s. In particular, the FEMC became the state's highest economic policymaking agency, whose task was to unify economic and financial policy to coordinate state-led projects to develop strategic industries.[85]

Chiang Kai-shek took the initiative in organizing the national security apparatus. In June 1969, he appointed his son Chiang Ching-kuo to the office of Vice-Premier in charge of the CIECD, the FEMC, and the Budget Inquiry Committee. Then he promoted Chiang Ching-kuo to the position of state Premier in 1971, giving him formal authority to run the government. Chiang Ching-kuo immediately directed the cabinet to prepare a plan for massive investments to strengthen the country both economically and militarily. This resulted in the creation of Ten Major Construction Projects, which became the centerpiece of the government's drive for heavy industrialization, which was targeted to establish an industrial basis of the state's defensive capability.[86]

---

[84] Hung-mao Tien, *The Great Transition: Political and Social Change in the Republic of China* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1989), 109-10.
[85] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*. 317-18.
[86] Ibid., 318.

4.2.3. Military Expenditure and Taxation

During the 1970s, Taiwan had the greatest share of its budget allocated to defense of any country, second only to Israel. It was also surpassed only by Israel and Iraq in the ratio of GNP allocated to military expenditure.[87] As Table 4-1 shows, the level of the ROC's defense expenditure as a share of the state's GDP during the 1970s was notably higher than those of South Korea and Japan. But it should be noted that a huge portion of Taiwan's defense expenditure was allocated to the maintenance of a large ground force, which represented the Kuomintang regime's commitment to offensive strategy toward mainland China. In this respect, the level of Taiwan's military expenditure itself may not represent the state's willingness to direct national resources toward the establishment of its own defensive capability.[88]

---

[87] Ibid., 285-86.

[88] Another problem is the limited availability of the primary source data, which helps to examine the ROC's military expenditure according to appropriation category.

Table 4-1. Military Expenditure of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, as a Percentage of GDP, 1967-1978.[89]

Year	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78
Japan	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Korea	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.4	5.0	5.7	6.4	5.4
Taiwan	11.2	11.1	9.7	8.8	9.6	9.3	8.4	7.0	6.8	6.6	7.5	7.5

To illustrate the domestic dimension of Taiwan's security-promoting drives, the present study examines how the nature of Taiwan's threat assessment affected the scope of its extraction of domestic resources under the initiative of national security. Extraction enables political leaders to gain rapid access to funds from the country's people; the more the state's leadership assesses that external threats are immediate, the more likely it is to depend on extraction of its domestic resources in developing autonomous defense capabilities.

As mentioned in the chapter on Korea, the ROK government introduced several policies of extraction to secure a revenue base for the state's projects for defense capabilities, including a compulsory National Defense Tax in 1975 and a National Investment Fund in 1973. These policy instruments facilitated South Korea's development of heavy industrialization projects as well the increase in the overall defense capabilities of its regular forces. In contrast, given the absence of direct military threats from the PRC, Taiwan did not introduce a policy of extraction directly targeted at increasing the state's defense capabilities.

---

[89] *SIPRI Yearbook*, Various Issues.

To be sure, the ROK government was able to increase its tax revenue during the 1970s. This was the result of the state's tax reform in 1968. The ROC government did institute a similar policy in response to the decline of the US military grants during the 1960s.[90] Facing the decrease in US assistance, the government formed the Commission on Taxation Reform in March 1968. Empowered with President Chiang's full authority, the commission was authorized to look for measures to improve tax administration, raise revenues, and increase the responsiveness of tax collection to increases in private income. The Commission's proposals called for an increase in revenue through an enlargement of the tax base, improvements in tax administration, and higher tax rates.

The tax reform, however, was not targeted primarily at financing the development of the ROC's defensive capability. Rather, as Table 4-2 shows, Taiwan decreased the portion of the government's budget allocated to defense while increasing the portion allocated to economic development projects and to the state's educational sector.[91] This suggests that the absence of direct military threats from communist China did not put the ROC leadership under pressure to prioritize short-term military preparedness over the state's longer-term objectives. Rather, it can be argued that the emphasis on sustainability focused the Taiwan government on the education and economic development sectors, which represented the state's long-term objectives.[92]

---

[90] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 319-20.

[91] In comparison, South Korea increased the portion of the government's budget going to defense expenditure during the 1970s.

[92] In this respect, Greene shows that the notion of international economic competitiveness led the leadership to emphasize the importance of technical competence and a better-educated labor force. See Megan J. Greene, The Origins of Developmental State in Taiwan: Science Policy and the Quest for Modernization (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2008).

Table 4-2. Allocation of the ROC Government's Net Expenditures, 1968-1979[93]

	Government Budget Total	Defense	Education, Science, and Culture	Economic Development	Other
1968	33,002	17,938 (54.4)	4,865 (14.7)	5,442 (16.5)	4,757 (14.4)
1969	41,869	20,393 (48.7)	6,818 (16.3)	7,197 (17.2)	7,461 (17.8)
1970	49,153	23,977 (48.8)	7,992 (16.3)	8,795 (17.9)	8,389 (17.1)
1971	54,829	26,172 (47.7)	9,636 (17.6)	8,512 (15.5)	10,509 (19.2)
1972	63,668	27,569 (43.3)	11,046 (17.3)	11,659 (18.3)	13,394 (21)
1973	79,856	33,074 (41.4)	13,512 (16.9)	18,207 (22.8)	15,063 (18.9)
1974	89,934	36,865 (41)	14,994 (16.7)	22,698 (25.2)	15,377 (17.1)
1975	126,436	49,608 (39.2)	20,741 (16.4)	37,486 (29.6)	16,745 (13.2)
1976	149,994	54,873 (36.6)	23,783 (15.9)	47,603 (31.7)	23,735 (15.8)
1977	192,493	69,498 (36.1)	28,277 (14.7)	66,693 (34.6)	28,025 (14.6)
1978	226,900	84,186 (37.1)	38,990 (17.2)	71,280 (31.4)	32,444 (14.3)
1979	254,711	95,400 (37.5)	41,228 (16.2)	77,567 (30.5)	40,516 (15.9)

4.2.4. The Development of Heavy Industrialization in Taiwan

The establishment of a vigorous economy through the development of heavy industry was an important goal of the ROC leadership as early as the late 1950s. Taiwan introduced planning measures to initiate heavy industrialization to support long-term economic growth. However, the ROC government did not pursue mass-scale heavy

[93] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 324. The unit is millions of New Taiwan Dollars. Percentage in each parenthesis is calculated by this author.

industrialization at that time because it was reluctant to allocate the necessary resources. Opposition also came from the Ministry of Finance, which was concerned about the costs involved in heavy industrialization. As a result, the push for heavy industrialization was largely shelved until the 1970s.[94] At that point, the decline in the US military and diplomatic commitment caused the ROC leadership to push for heavy industrialization as an alternative to the US industrial base that it had relied upon for Taiwan's defense.[95]

The state's establishment of an industrial foundation for autonomous defensive capability began with the issuance of the Long Range Plan in 1971. The plan called for the development of strategic industries with a decisive importance to Taiwan's defense capability. They included shipbuilding, machinery, electrical equipment and steel, and plastics and resins.[96] This policy response differed somewhat from the state's response to reduced US financial support during the late 1950s. In the latter case, the ROC leadership did not emphasize the necessity for becoming independent from the US security commitment. In contrast, the decline in the US military and diplomatic commitment during the 1970s led the ROC leadership to push for heavy industrialization as an alternative to US military protection.[97]

As in the case of South Korea, the ROC government introduced several policies to financially support the heavy-industrialization project. In doing so, the government tightly controlled the state banks dominating Taiwan's financial system.[98] This allowed

---

[94] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 306.
[95] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 49.
[96] Kristen Nordhaug, "Development through Want of Security: The Case of Taiwan," *Pacific Focus* 7, no.1 (1997): 144.
[97] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 306.
[98] Ibid., 328-32.

ROC policymakers to direct the banks toward investing in the targeted strategic industries. As a result, Taiwan was able to integrate the state's industrial and financial policies. For example, the Ministry of Finance (MOF) coordinated with the Central Bank to look for means to increase capital accumulation, encourage private saving, and funnel available financial resources into strategic industries.[99] The MOF also introduced a series of policies to transform commercial banks into industrial and investment banks, which specialized in lending to targeted industries.[100]

The ROC government also introduced policy instruments to raise national savings. Since both private and public savings were placed into state banks, the government was able to directly access these resources to use according to the state's needs. This suggests that the state needed to raise the saving rate, which would lead to an increase in the available financial resources allocated toward industrial development. The government's policy, combined with other factors, contributed to Taiwan's high savings rate, which in turn led to an increase in national savings and investment during the 1970s. As a result, the ROC's large-scale investment plan gained momentum from the mid-1970s.[101] As Table 4-3 shows, the targeted strategic industries gained momentum during the 1970s.

---

[99] Ibid., 341.
[100] Robert Wade, *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 168.
[101] Phillips, *The Origins of Taiwan's Trade and Industrial Policies*, 333-38.

Table 4-3. Output of Products from Strategic Heavy Industries in Taiwan, 1969-1979[102]

	Steel Bars (m.t)	Machine Tools (unit)	Motor Vehicles (set)	Ship Building (g.t)	Electric Power (k.w.h.)
1969	512,116	68,085		117,329	797
1970	607,016	106,624		217,421	911
1971	722,215	127,153	19,591	279,711	1,023
1972	862,161	171,781	22,012	305,405	1,153
1973	1,072,498	162,399	23,759	341,249	1,284
1974	1,029,022	137,078	28,915	355,743	1,308
1975	1,173,540	179,646	31,278	315,089	1,432
1976	1,733,622	206,843	31,013	456,284	1,650
1977	1,976,696	297,100	44,272	703,550	1,785
1978	2,901,398	388,683	77,177	431,130	2,028
1979	3,449,539	406,997	116,103	382,051	2,189

As in the case of South Korea, the existence of strong leadership facilitated the placement of heavy industrialization under the initiative of national security. Thus, the success of industrialization in the two states depended to a great extent upon the leadership of strongmen, President Park Chung Hee in South Korea and Chiang Ching-kuo in Taiwan. They decided which industries should be developed and introduced various policy instruments to promote the targeted industries, as well as barriers to protect them.

But a different pattern between the states should be also noted. Taiwan did not allow privately held conglomerates to partake in the industrialization projects. Instead, ROC leadership largely depended upon state-owned enterprise.[103] In contrast, the ROK government directed domestic big businesses to participate in the development of strategic industries during the 1970s. As a result, industrialization in South Korea was characterized by a conglomerate-dominated pattern.

---

[102] Ibid., 350-351. Unit is in each parenthesis.
[103] Ibid., 352.

It can be argued that state-society relationships affected the different patterns adopted by Taiwan and South Korea in their industrialization policies.[104] According to this argument, the nature of the "*émigré regime*" encouraged the Kuomintang government to minimize the influence of social forces and to dominate the native Taiwanese. This caused the ROC leadership to remain watchful of private businesses, the majority of which were owned by Taiwanese natives. This explains why the ROC government did not allow them to partake in industrialization projects. In contrast, South Korean leadership fostered a few large conglomerates in the domestic market and allied with them after the launch of its economic development project in 1961. The existing affiliation led to the ROK government's encouragement of big business to partake in developing strategic industries during the 1970s.

The aforementioned argument, however, disregards the fact that the two states commonly introduced their heavy industrialization projects as a security-promoting strategy. In this respect, one should consider each state's assessment of its own security as the primary factor explaining its development of heavy industrialization. Thus, while acknowledging the state-business relationship as important, the present study focuses on security assessment to explain the differences between Taiwan and South Korea.

As mentioned earlier, the ROC leadership concluded that a military threat from the PRC was not imminent. Rather, it was concerned about communist China's apparent attempt to isolate Taiwan from the rest of the world. In addition, the leadership feared a

---

[104] Yongping Wu, "Rethinking the Taiwanese Developmental State," *The China Quarterly* 177, March (2004): 91-114; Yongping Wu, *A Political Explanation of Economic Growth: State Survival, Bureaucratic Politics, and Private Enterprises in the Making of Taiwan's Economy, 1950-1985* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

war of economic attrition in which the PRC's consumer products might capture a large portion of Taiwan's foreign market.[105] This threat assessment led the leadership to emphasize sustaining economic viability as a survival strategy.[106]

This case study argues that the nature of the ROC leadership's threat assessment influenced the leadership's decision to exclude the private sector from the state-led push toward heavy industrialization. The leadership's concern for economic survival, coupled with the absence of direct military threat from the PRC, arguably led it to balance the state's security needs with the maintenance of economic viability. This arguably increased the leadership's sensitivity to the trade-offs inherent in directing privately held conglomerates toward the defense industry "at the expense of civilian development objectives."[107] This explains why the ROC government prevented the private sectors from participating in the industrialization projects, which might have the potential to negatively affect the growth of the state's overall economy.

By comparison, the South Korean leadership assessed that North Korea would use the US in East Asia as a window of opportunity to realize its revisionist purposes, both militarily and politically. This security concern was also reinforced by the withdrawal of US forces from Vietnam and US President Carter's frequent calls to withdraw all US ground forces from South Korea. This security assessment led ROK leadership to conclude that North Korea presented an imminent military threat.

---

[105] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 48.
[106] In this respect, Washington assessed that the PRC's strategy of isolation led the ROC leadership to consider establishing economic viability for the state's survival. See FRUS China 1969-1972, 1003-4.
[107] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 48.

Given the nature of the threat assessment, the imperative of establishing autonomous defensive capability required the ROK leadership to rapidly increase the development of the strategic defense industries. This helps to explain why the ROK government depended not only upon state-owned enterprises but also on domestic big businesses to establish an industrial basis for increasing defensive capabilities. In this respect, the scope of the ROK's domestic drive was wider than that of Taiwan.

In addition, the urgency of security led the ROK leadership to prioritize security over economic rationale. Thus, the leadership constrained market rationality in favor of promoting the targeted industries, harnessing domestic and international market forces where necessary for security purposes. As a result, during the 1970s, the state's defense industry and was almost completely insulated from market pressure and even insured from failure through government subsidies.

In contrast, ROC leadership tried to balance security and economic rationale in its industrialization policies. In this respect, Nolan suggests the following conclusion:

> Both [Taiwan and South Korea] devote enormous resources to military preparedness, at obvious cost to their economies. … … The differences between the two states, however, overshadow their similarities. Taiwan, as a result of careful and deliberate policy, has managed the difficult process of economic growth with a minimum of disruption and political discontent. Taiwan's leaders understand that economic difficulties can only heighten the island's political isolation, perhaps at last to a fatal degree. Korea, by contrast, has been overly ambitious and aggressive, and the economic problems that threaten its long-term security are largely, though certainly not solely of its own making. … … Korea has expanded its economy beyond the ability of domestic structures to accommodate change. Rectifying the serious imbalances that now exist after more than two decades of blind and rapid growth will require major reforms in the Korean economy.[108]

---

[108] Ibid., 87.

4.2.5. Policy of Taiwanization

The Kuomintang's theory of political tutelage rested on the notion that citizens should be mobilized behind the initiative of a revolutionary party. Since the early 1920s, Kuomintang had attempted to penetrate volunteer associations and subordinate them within the party ranks. Soon after it returned to Taiwan in 1949, Chiang Kai-shek established a close alliance among the party, military, and government, allowing the Kuomintang to function as the core of the alliance.[109] Then he took measures to make it possible for the party apparatus to penetrate systematically into every sector of society.[110] Accordingly, party cells were established in all societal groups at all levels, which included labor unions, farmers' associations, professional organizations, state enterprises, the business community, and student and youth organizations.[111] As a result, during the 1950s, nearly all politically relevant groups were organized by the party or the state organs it controlled.[112]

The ruling party's tight control over societal organization suggests that the ROC government was able to mobilize a substantial level of societal support under the security initiative. So the question is whether the leadership actually mobilized societal support under the state's security initiative in response to the US retrenchment during the 1970s. The following examination shows that the ROC government did not mobilize societal

---

[109] Clough, *Island China*, 33-68.
[110] Tien, *The Great Transition*, 59.
[111] Michael Ying-mao Kau, "The Power Structure in Taiwan's Political Economy," *Asian Survey* 36, no. 3: 288-89.
[112] Rigger, *Politics in Taiwan*, 74-7.

support under the state's security initiative. This is arguably puzzling, considering the fact that the ROC leadership faced challenges toward its authority during the 1970s.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the ROC leadership enjoyed domestic and international stability.[113] Domestic opposition groups were all but invisible because there was no room for civil activism to develop under the strong rule of Chiang Kai-shek, while the dynamic of state corporatism turned many Taiwanese into supporters of the government. Meanwhile, the Cold War confrontation required the US and the international community to sustain support for Taiwan as a defense against the expansion of communism in East Asia. However, that stability was shaken as the ROC leadership was increasingly challenged on both domestic and international sides.

Taiwan experienced several international setbacks during the 1970s, which were followed by declining public confidence and morale, economic difficulties, and stirrings of domestic opposition.[114] The most serious challenge came from expatriate Taiwanese opposition movements, which argued that Taiwan's hope for freedom only lay in replacing the authoritarian government with a leadership of native Taiwanese with no territorial claim to mainland China. In addition, there was a domestic movement committed to a fundamental reform of the ROC's political system. The ROC government was also faced with criticism of its weak response to Japan's claim on the Tiaoyutai island chain, which is located in the East China Sea, between Taiwan and Japan.

---

[113] Ibid., 103.
[114] Ibid., 108-10.

The PRC's peace offensive also challenged the ROC leadership's authority.[115] Beijing appealed to the ROC government for a negotiated settlement of Taiwan's status. From Beijing's standpoint, a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue would open the door for the eventual subjugation of the Kuomintang regime. Beijing also took steps to obtain the sympathy and support of native Taiwanese in order to alienate them from the Nationalist regime.

What compounded these challenges was the development of factionalism within the Kuomintang and uncertainty about the succession to Chiang Kai-shek.[116] By 1972, Chiang Ching-kuo had taken on many of his father's responsibilities, but there was no consensus within the ruling party regarding whether Chiang Ching-kuo should succeed his father. In addition, President Chiang's increasing infirmity intensified anxieties over Taiwan's political future.

The emergence of these challenges suggests that the ROC leadership's link with domestic society weakened. This diminished the state's ability to balance external threats.[117] If the leadership had felt the urgency to increase security, it would have introduced a large-scale domestic campaign to mobilize societal support under the security initiative. But the leadership's assessment of the PRC's threats suggests that it did not have an incentive to introduce such a large-scale domestic drive. The absence of direct threats from its adversary also made it hard for the ROC leadership to manipulate

---

[115] Hung-mao Tien, "Taiwan in Transition: Prospects for Socio-Political Change," *The China Quarterly* 64, December (1975): 634.
[116] Rigger, *Politics in Taiwan*, 103.
[117] This point refers to Schweller's argument that a state's capacity for balancing external threats is negatively affected by the state's internal vulnerability. See Schweller, *Unanswered Threats*, 49-50.

external threats to strengthen the state-society link. Rather, the ROC government moderated its position in dealing with oppositional movements.

This moderate policy, which is dubbed "Taiwanization," attempted to gradually incorporate the native Taiwanese into the state's political system. Two dimensions characterized the policy of Taiwanization.[118] First, the ROC government tried to reform national parliamentary bodies to make them more representative of Taiwan citizens. More open electoral competition made it possible to co-opt many social forces. Second, the government tried to achieve "interethnic power-sharing" through the method of recruiting more Taiwanese into the Kuomintang regime. As a result, the number of ethnic Taiwanese in leadership positions at provincial and local levels and in party organs rapidly increased after 1972.[119] These aspects of political transition suggest that there was a shift from hard to soft authoritarianism in the sense that resorting to authoritarian repression came to be less frequent, less direct, and more legalistic, even while the Kuomintang's dominance was still guaranteed.[120]

The policy of Taiwanization can be seen as the ROC leadership's strategy to ensure the state's political survival by strengthening its foundation in Taiwanese society.[121] In the process, Chiang Ching-kuo orchestrated a major party reform to ease the regime away from its authoritarian tendencies. In contrast, the imperative of national security in the military sense led the Park regime in South Korea to establish a garrison state in South

---

[118] Harvey Feldman, Michael Y.M. Kau, and Ilpyong J. Kim, *Taiwan in a Time of Transition* (New York: Paragon House, 1988).
[119] Rigger, *Politics in Taiwan*, 111.
[120] Winckler, "Institutionalization and Participation on Taiwan,"
[121] In this respect, a memorandum for Kissinger expected that the collaboration between the mainlander and Taiwanese would increase in the face of the danger from Beijing. See FRUS China 1969-1972, 1003.

Korea, strengthening government control over domestic society. It also introduced ideological mobilization to secure societal support for the state's industrialization program. This pattern, so different from the one in Taiwan, lends support to the argument that the state's willingness to mobilize societal support for national military preparedness depends on its security assessment.

4.3. The Rise and Fall of Taiwan's Nuclear Development Project in the 1970s

Dreaming of a triumphant return to mainland China, Chiang Kai-shek made known his ambition to retake the mainland using military means. Washington tried to restrain Taiwan's unilateral raids on the mainland and other provocative actions in order to avoid a direct confrontation with communist China. In this respect, Washington's dilemma was that it was forced to pursue a policy of dual deterrence. The US had to signal its resolve to deter communist China from attacking Taiwan, while ensuring that the Taiwanese leadership did not interpret this resolve as a signal to engage in provocative actions against the mainland.[122] Taiwan's shift of emphasis from offensive to defensive strategy toward the end of 1960s suggests that the ROC had no intention of engaging in a unilateral offensive action against the PRC.

But the development of Taiwan's nuclear weapon capability posed another challenge for Washington's policy of dual deterrence. Taiwan allegedly engaged in early tentative efforts to develop nuclear weapons in response to the PRC's first nuclear test in 1964.[123]

---

[122] Cha, "Powerplay," 168-73.

[123] Derek Mitchell, "Taiwan's Hsin Chu Project: Deterrence, Abandonment, and Honor," in *The Nuclear*

The Chungshan Institute of Science and Technology (CIST), which was founded in 1965 under the sponsorship of the ROC Defense Ministry, financially supported Taiwan's nuclear program. The program, which was dubbed the "Hsin Chu" program, was placed under the authority of the Institute of Nuclear Energy Research (INER), after its beginning in 1967. The program was targeted to produce and operate a heavy-water reactor, a heavy-water production plant, a reprocessing research lab and a plutonium separation plant.[124]

Washington intervened as early as 1966 to ensure that Taiwan would adhere to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to prevent diversion of materials to building nuclear weapons.[125] Under US pressure, Taiwan and the IAEA reached a safeguard agreement in 1971.[126] According to this agreement, any nuclear materials that Taiwan acquired would be subject to restrictions in their application under U.S. law. In this manner, the US became the ultimate guarantor of Taiwan's status as a non-nuclear weapons state.[127]

However, the 1971 agreement could not prevent Taiwan from pursuing a military nuclear program. As Chiang Ching-kuo acknowledged in 1975, Taiwan acquired basic

---

Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices, eds. Kurt M. Campbell, Robert J. Einhorn, and Mitchell Reiss (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), 296.

124 David Albright and Corey Gay, "Taiwan: Nuclear Nightmare Averted," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 54, no. 1 (1998): 55.

125 William Burr, *New Archival Evidence on Taiwanese "Nuclear Intentions," 1966-1976* (*The National Security Archive, Electronic Briefing Book 221,* 1999). http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/ (Accessed March 6, 2015).

126 Vincent We-Cheng Wang, "Taiwan: Conventional Deterrence, Soft Power, and the Nuclear Option," in *The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia*, ed. Muthiah Alagappa (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008), 414.

127 Mitchell, "Taiwan's Hsin Chu Project," 298-98.

capabilities for nuclear weapons production by 1974.[128] For example, Taiwan's Institute of Nuclear Energy Research (INER) developed a fuel fabrication factory. In addition, it secured approximately 100 metric tons of uranium from South Africa, which was much more than was necessary to operate the heavy-water research reactor, which it had purchased from Canada in 1969.[129] In addition, as a part of the Hsin Chu program, the CIST tried to acquire a large-scale reprocessing plant through negotiations with West Germany.[130]

The development of the Sino-American rapprochement caused Washington to become hypersensitive about the direction of Taiwan's nuclear program. Months after Nixon's visit to Beijing in February 1972, State Department commissioned the CIA to prepare a report on the subject.[131] The CIA's report, entitled Special National Intelligence Estimate, opined that Taiwan's "present intention is to develop the capability to fabricate and test a nuclear device."[132] Department of State intelligence did not find any hard evidence that the ROC leadership intended to develop an nuclear weapon capability.[133] But the State Department decided to dispatch a special study mission to Taipei to identify the "ROC coterie which advocates development of nuclear weapons capabilities."[134] The

---

[128] Taylor, *The Generalissimo's Son*, 323.
[129] Albright and Gay, "Nuclear Nightmare Averted," 57.
[130] US Department of State, Memorandum of Conversation, "German Inquiry Regarding Safeguards on Export of Parts to ROC Reprocessing Plant," 22 November 1972, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc16.pdf (March 6, 2016).
[131] US Central Intelligence Agency, Special National Intelligence Estimate 43-1-72, "Taipei's Capabilities and Intentions Regarding Nuclear Weapons Development," 16 (?) November 1972, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-1a.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[132] Ibid.
[133] Burr, *New Archival Evidence on Taiwanese "Nuclear Intentions."*
[134] US Embassy Taipei, Cable 2354 to the US State Department, "ROC Nuclear Intentions," 20 April 1973, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc25.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).

study team visited Taiwan during November of 1973, picking up hints that Taiwan was keeping open the option of developing nuclear weapons.[135]

The ROC government decided to develop its nuclear weapons capability as an alternative to relying on the US security commitment. As Leonard S. Unger, the US Ambassador to Taiwan, pointed out, "Washington would ultimately break diplomatic relations and formal security ties with Taiwan as part of a normalization deal with Beijing … … ROC actions will probably be affected by its perception of its security following the termination of the US/ROC mutual defense treaty."[136] It was plain that the Taiwan's existential vulnerability vis-à-vis the PRC was a driving force behind the development of a military nuclear program.[137]

However, a study of Taiwan's military nuclear program during the 1970s should consider the following two factors, which, jointly, raise questions about why the ROC government attempted to develop nuclear weapons. First, ROC leadership was not concerned about direct military threats from communist China. Second, the US was "Taiwan's main market, source of foreign investment, and provider of weapons and security guarantees."[138] Considering this dependence, Taiwan was well advised not to develop a nuclear weapons capability, as it would conceivably prompt retaliation from Washington.[139]

---

[135] William Burr, *The Nuclear Vault* (The National Security Archive. Electronic Briefing Book No. 221, 2007). http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/ (Accessed March 6, 2015).
[136] US Embassy in Taiwan, Cable 332 to State Department, "US Nuclear Team Conclusions and Recommendations," 17 February 1977. http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-10g.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[137] Etel Solingen, *Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 102.
[138] Ibid., 112.
[139] As the SNIE suggested, given Taiwan's dependence upon the US security commitment, "any move

The present study characterizes Taiwan's pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability as a security-seeking strategy designed to pressure Washington to reverse the objectionable policy of rapprochement with the ROC's main adversary. It can be argued that ROC leadership tried to increase the price Washington would have to pay for abandoning Taiwan, by jeopardizing US strategic interests. The ROC's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability went against US strategic interests in stabilizing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was developed in the aftermath of India's first successful nuclear test in 1974. The spread of nuclear weapons capabilities became a major concern for Washington; while there were a number of proliferation challenges other than India, such as Brazil, Pakistan, and South Korea, Taiwan was a special case because its military nuclear program would plainly cause strain on US efforts to place "Sino-American relations on a nonconfrontational basis."[140]

Thus, it is no surprise that Washington opposed the development of Taiwan's military nuclear program. Washington began with introducing a low-key approach, issuing verbal warnings and blocking the ROC's efforts to secure nuclear weapons technology through foreign assistance. In September 1972, for example, the Nixon administration tried to extract a pledge from the leadership of Taiwan to forego pursuing an independent nuclear weapons capability.[141] Another verbal warning was given to

---

which might imperil that relationship would not likely be taken without long and careful study." Thus it concluded that even though the ROC leadership would keep its nuclear option open, it was doubtful that "a decision would be made to proceed with testing or with the fabrication and stockpiling of untested devices." See US Central Intelligence Agency, Special National Intelligence Estimate 43-1-72.

[140] Burr, *The Nuclear Vault*.

[141] Burr, *New Archival Evidence on Taiwanese "Nuclear Intentions."*

Taiwanese officials in October 1973.[142] Washington also discouraged the ROC government from purchasing a reprocessing facility from West Germany.[143]

Facing pressure from its greatest ally, the ROC government assured the US that it would definitely drop efforts to acquire a reprocessing plant and limit its nuclear program to peaceful uses.[144] But it became known later that the low-key approach was not sufficient to stop Taiwan's military nuclear program. This put US policymakers under pressure to increase the pressure on the ROC government.[145] However, Washington could clearly not threaten with sanctions before Congress introduced the Symington amendment in 1976, which authorized the US to strengthen its position on nuclear proliferation.[146]

The absence of a direct threat of sanctions from Washington made it possible for the ROC government to continue its military nuclear program. As a 1974 CIA estimate concluded, "Taipei conducts its small nuclear program with a weapon option clearly in mind, and it will be in a position to fabricate a nuclear device after five years or so."[147]

---

[142] US Department of State, Roger Sullivan to Assistant Secretary of State for Far East and Pacific Affairs Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., "Nuclear Study Group Visit to Taiwan," 29 October 1973 http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-2b.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[143] US Department of State, Cable 2051 to Embassies in Bonn, Brussels, and Taipei, "Proposed Reprocessing Plant for Republic of China," 4 January 1973, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc01.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[144] US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 7051 to State Department, "Fonmin Reaffirms ROC Decision to Refrain from Acquiring Nuclear Reprocessing Plant," 23 November 1973, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-3b.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[145] US Department of State, Memorandum from Leo J. Moser, Office of Republic of China Affairs, to Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Marshall Green, "Nuclear Materials Reprocessing Plant for ROC," 14 December 1972, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc17.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[146] Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 931.
[147] Albright and Gay, "Nuclear Nightmare Averted," 57.

By September 1976, the Department of State received conclusive evidence that the INER was undertaking a covert program to gain reprocessing technology.[148]

Reacting to growing concerns about the direction of Taiwan's nuclear program, the State Department instructed the US Embassy in Taipei to clearly threaten "an end to nuclear cooperation."[149] Unger was also instructed to deliver the following message: "Should the ROC or any other government seek national reprocessing facilities, this would risk jeopardizing additional highly important relationships with the US."[150] The US ambassador pressed Premier Chiang to give assurances that Taiwan would abandon the project to develop a pilot reprocessing plant. In response, Chiang assured the US government that the ROC would abandon the project. In September 1976, the Premier and his cabinet issued a public statement which declared that the ROC had no "intention whatsoever to use its human and natural resources for the development of nuclear weapons or to obtain equipment for reprocessing spent nuclear fuel."[151]

By the end of 1976, the US embassy in Taipei still reported that "We have rather compelling evidence that in spite of solemn and public assurances given by the GROC [Government of the Republic of China] and personally by Premier Chiang, the Chinese may not yet have given up their intentions of acquiring a capability for reprocessing nuclear fuels."[152] The report led Washington to conclude that the ROC government was

---

[148] Burr, *The Nuclear Vault*.
[149] Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 931.
[150] US Department of State, Cable 91733 to Embassy Taiwan, "ROC's Nuclear Intentions," 4 September 1976, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-6a.pdf (accessed last on March 6, 2016).
[151] US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 6301 to State Department, "ROC's Nuclear Intentions," 17 September 1976, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-7b.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[152] US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 8654 to State Department, "U.S. Nuclear Team Visit," 30 December 1976, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-10a.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).

not living up to its commitment.[153] This suggested that Washington's nonproliferation efforts were still too vague for the ROC government to take seriously.[154] Consequently, Washington increased the credibility of its threats by presenting a number of far-reaching demands, which included termination of all fuel cycle activities, reorientation of facilities involving or leading to weapons-usable materials, transfer of all plutonium to the US, and avoidance of any program or activity which, upon consultation with the US, would be determined to apply to the development of a nuclear explosive capability.[155] In addition, the Carter administration successfully communicated to the ROC government its determination to do everything to prevent nuclear proliferation.[156]

Taiwan subsequently complied with the US demands to the point that Washington became confident of the ROC government's nonproliferation efforts by the middle of 1977. As Carter's security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski reported to him, Premier Chiang allowed that Washington's effort to "crack down" on Taiwan's nuclear project "clearly yielded its desired results."[157] In addition, Unger reported that the ROC government "has made an honest, albeit reluctant, effort to comply."[158] The US nuclear team was also

---

153 Burr, *New Archival Evidence on Taiwanese "Nuclear Intentions."*

154 For example, even after being informed of the US determination to prevent proliferation, the ROC vice foreign minister Chien Fu still asked, "out of 'curiosity,' what the penalties would be in the event a nation did not follow U.S. non-proliferation guidelines." See US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 332 to State Department, "US Nuclear Team Visit to ROC - Calls," 19 January 1977, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-10e.pdf (Accessed March 6, 2016).

155 US Department of State, Cable 67316 to the US Embassy in Taipei, "Nuclear Representation to the ROC," 26 March 1977, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-13a.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).

156 Miller, "The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions," 932.

157 Zbigniew Brzezinski to President Carter, "Weekly National Security Report #11," 29 April 1977, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-14.pdf (Accessed March 6, 2016).

158 US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 2646 to State Department, "Visit of CAEC Secretary General - Dr. Victor Cheng," 6 May 1977, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-15a.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).

confident that "ROC officials were cooperative and indicated willingness to take all steps necessary to assure compliance with agreements."[159]

As the case of South Korea, Taiwan's compliance with the US derived from its consideration of that state's substantial dependence upon the United States. As Premier Chiang argued, Taiwan's vulnerability and unique relationship with the United States allowed Washington to deal with the ROC "in a fashion which few other countries would tolerate."[160] In this respect, Taiwanese high-ranking officials believed that "it would be folly for [the] ROC to endanger its nuclear power program by conducting nuclear activities of questionable nature."[161] Thus one can reach the following conclusion: "The [Kuomintang] and its successors' military, political, and economic dependence on the US are central to understanding Taiwan's nuclear history. Nuclear decisions were embedded in a model of regime survival emphasizing economic growth, prosperity, stability, and the defeat of internal subversion, which explains widespread receptivity to US demands and inducements."[162]

The rise and fall of Taiwan's military nuclear program during the 1970s suggests that the ROC leadership, like its counterpart in South Korea, was trying to pressure the United States to reverse its objectionable strategic posture in East Asia. According to the theory posited in this study, the scope of a regional state's willingness to engage in military behaviors against its patron's strategic interests is a function of its security

---

159 US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 3158 to State Department, "U.S. Technical Team Visit," 31 May 1977, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-16a.pdf (Accessed March 6, 2016).
160 US Embassy in Taipei, Cable 6065 to State Department, "Follow-up to Nuclear Team Visit: Demarche to President Chiang," 8 September 1978, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/T-21a.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
161 US Embassy in Taipei, "US Nuclear Team Visit to ROC – Calls."
162 Solingen, *Nuclear Logics*, 116.

concern in response to the patron's retrenchment. The ROK leadership's concern about North Korea's revisionist strategy was coupled with its skepticism of the reliability of US security commitment. In comparison, the ROC leadership did not have an urgent need to militarily balance communist China, even though it was skeptical of its patron's commitment. This suggests that the level of ROK leadership's security concern was relatively higher than that of the ROC leadership. Accordingly, there should be a meaningful difference between the two countries in their pursuit of a military behavior against the strategic interests of the United States. Regarding this, the present study raises the following two points.

First, the ROC leadership was relatively unwilling to develop a missile capability as part of the military nuclear program. Taiwan found it difficult to develop a missile capability, an essential part of any nuclear deterrence program, during the 1960s. In the mid-1970s, the ROC government initiated a missile program, which included hiring missile-related specialists overseas and allocating research resources for developing a medium-range ballistic missile. In addition, it was estimated that the ROC's defense industry matured during the 1970s to such an extent that Taiwan was able to produce surface-to-surface missiles.[163] However, the ROC government did not develop the nuclear project beyond the initial stage, as it faced US pressure.[164] As a result, Taiwan could not develop the medium-range ballistic missiles or space launchers that were required to establish a nuclear deterrence capability.[165] In contrast, the chapter on Korea

---

[163] SIPRI, *SIPRI Yearbook* (Taylor & Francis, 1981), 81.
[164] Nolan, *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*, 57.
[165] Dinshaw Mistry, *Containing Missile Proliferation Strategic Technology, Security Regimes, and International Cooperation in Arms Control* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 97.

shows that the ROK government sustained its project of missile development while facing direct pressure from Washington.

The comparison of Taiwan and South Korea in terms of their response to US pressure suggests that the ROC leadership was less committed than its ROK counterpart to the pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability. The ROK leadership was so committed to the pursuit of nuclear and missile programs that it was unwilling to abandon the programs even in the face of Washington's coercive efforts to reverse them. In contrast, Washington found it relatively easy to make the ROC leadership to abandon the pursuit of a missile capability.

Second, the ROC leadership was relatively divided over the necessity for developing a nuclear weapons capability, while the ROK did not witness such internal division. As the US Embassy in Taipei reported, Chiang Kai-shek was the prime mover in the nuclear weapons project.[166] Chiang Ching-kuo, the president's son and successor, also took the initiative in the state's decision to attempt the separation of plutonium.[167] Despite the existence of a political initiative to develop nuclear weapons, there was internal division within the ROC leadership regarding such a step.

On the one hand, the ROC military played a key role in developing a nuclear weapons capability. Because of its role as the key agency in charge of the nuclear weapons development project under the ROC Defense Ministry's sponsorship, the CIST

---

[166] US Embassy in Taipei, Airgram 1037, "Indications GRC Continues to Pursue Atomic Weaponry," 20 June 1966, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc18.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[167] Albright and Gay, "Nuclear Nightmare Averted," 56.

was a source of concern for Washington's efforts at nonproliferation.[168] Under its aegis, the INER secretly developed a small reprocessing facility and acquired a research reactor.

On the other hand, there were a group of policymakers within the government that was opposed to the development of a nuclear weapons capability. General Tang Chun-po, Vice Minister of Defense, for example, was opposed to the project, as he believed that it would be impractical.[169] Professor Ta-You Wu, a science adviser to president Chiang, was another member of the group. While witnessing the development of the project since its beginning in the 1960s, he criticized it for underestimating the true risk of causing a confrontation with the United States and for overestimating its chance of success.[170] The Atomic Energy Council in Taiwan also played its part. In March 1973, Victor Cheng, Secretary General of the civilian-controlled agency, privately informed US diplomats about the state's reprocessing deal with West Germany, emphasizing his concern about the military-led project to acquire a fuel reprocessing capability.[171] This provided Washington with an opportunity to raise concerns over Taiwan's military nuclear program.

The development of internal division over the military nuclear program suggests that the ROC government was less willing than the ROK leadership to pursue military behavior against the U.S. strategic interests. Taiwan found it difficult to form a consensus between military and civilian sectors over the necessity of developing a nuclear weapons capability. The internal division provided Washington with leverage to control the

---

[168] US Department of State, Cable 51747 to Embassies in Taipei and Tokyo, "ROC Nuclear Research," 21 March 1973, http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/docs/doc29.pdf (accessed March 6, 2016).
[169] US Embassy in Taipei, "Indications GRC Continues to Pursue Atomic Weaponry."
[170] Albright and Gay, "Nuclear Nightmare Averted," 56.
[171] US Department of State, "ROC Nuclear Research."

direction of Taiwan's nuclear program by strengthening "the hand of moderate elements in the ROC with regard to its peaceful uses of nuclear energy."[172] This explains why Washington found it relatively easy to force Taiwan to abandon its objectionable military behavior.[173]

4.4. Chapter Conclusion

The theory of this research hypothesized co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of the state's efforts to increase the contribution of domestic society to the establishment of an autonomous defense capability. This research also suggests the existence of co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of military behaviors against the patron's strategic interests.

If we compare South Korea and Japan in terms of the leadership's security concern in response to the US strategic posture in East Asia, the former is at one end of the spectrum while the latter is at the other end of the spectrum. The ROC leadership experienced substantially high level of security concern while the Japanese leadership experienced substantially low level of security concern in response to the superpower's retrenchment during the 1970s. This explains why there was a sharp difference in the two

---

[172] US Embassy in Taipei, "Visit of CAEC Secretary General - Dr. Victor Cheng."

[173] The existence of domestic opposition groups made it possible for Washington to introduce "domestic-focused non-proliferation strategy." See Scott D. Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," *International Security* 21, no. 3 (1996/97): 63-73; Bruce W. Jentleson and Christopher A. Whytock, "Who "Won" Libya? The Force-Diplomacy Debate and Its Implications for Theory and Policy," *International Security* 30, no. 3: 50.

states' security-promoting behaviors during the 1970s. First, South Korea was strongly committed to the pursuit of military policies against the US strategic interests while Japan developed its military policies in line with the superpower's strategic interests. Second, the ROK leadership introduced huge-scale domestic drives to rapidly increase the contribution of domestic society to an autonomous defense capability while the Japanese leadership established a minimalist approach to security.

The present chapter tests the theory of this research against Taiwan's security-seeking behaviors during the 1970s in response to the US retrenchment in East Asia. For this purpose, the case study documents the nature of the ROC leadership's security assessment. Then it examines whether there was co-variation between the level of the leadership's security concern and the scope of Taiwan's domestic drives to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability. It also examines whether there was co-variation between the level of the leadership's security concern and the level of Taiwan's commitment to the pursuit of a military behavior against the superpower's strategic interests.

The present chapter documents the ROC leadership's security concern. There are three points that together suggest that the leadership was highly skeptical of the US reliability. First, the US ambiguity during the development of Sino-American rapprochement made the ROC leadership skeptical of the patron's reliability. Second, the leadership believed that the US gave up its security commitment to Taiwan. Third, Taiwan believed that Washington did not do all it could do, or all it had promised to do, to keep the ROC's representation in the UN. But the ROC leadership also believed that the PRC's offensive military strategy toward Taiwan was constrained by the Sino-Soviet

Conflict and the development of the Sino-American rapprochement. This belief lessened Taiwan's security concern.

Thus the level of the ROC leadership's security concern is estimated to be relatively higher than that of Japan but to be relatively lower than that of South Korea. Accordingly, the degree of the ROC leadership's willingness to promote domestic contribution to defensive capability was hypothesized to be relatively higher than that of the Japanese leadership but to be relatively lower than that of the ROK counterpart. The case study supports this hypothesis. In doing so, it introduces a two-step approach in measuring the scope of the ROC leadership's security-promoting domestic drives during the 1970s.

On the one hand, the case study finds that the ROC leadership's security concern led to Taiwan's introduction of security-promoting domestic drives. First, the ROC government developed a defense industry as it shifted emphasis toward the development of an autonomous defensive capability. Second, it established a highly centralized decision-making process to encompass an economic and social agenda in its defense program. A third finding is that the ROC leadership pushed for heavy industrialization as an alternative to the US industrial base that it had relied upon for defense. The government also financially supported the development of its targeted strategic industries, which had a decisive importance on Taiwan's defense capability.

On the other hand, this case study finds several points to suggest that the leadership of Taiwan was less willing than its ROK counterpart to introduce security-promoting domestic drives. First, Taiwan did not introduce a policy instrument that particularly targeted the extraction of domestic resources toward autonomous defense capability. In contrast, South Korea introduced several policy instruments to extract national resources

to establish a revenue base of its defensive capability. Second, the ROC government decreased the portion of the government's budget allocated to defense spending while increasing the portion allocated to the state's long-term objectives. This suggests the ROC leadership was not under pressure to prioritize short-term security preparedness over other long-term objectives. In contrast, South Korea felt itself to be under such pressure. Third, Taiwan tried to balance security and economic rationale while pushing for heavy industrialization. In contrast, the urgency of security caused the ROK government to constrain economic rationality in favor of promoting strategic industries. Fourth, the Kuomintang regime did not introduce social mobilization under the initiative of national security. In contrast, the imperative of security led the ROK regime to establish a garrison state in South Korea while introducing ideological mobilization to secure societal support for the state's push toward heavy industrialization.

According to the theory of this research, it is also hypothesized that the ROC leadership was less committed than the ROK counterpart to the pursuit of a military policy that went against the US strategic interests. This hypothesis is supported by the case study. Like South Korea, the ROC leadership developed a nuclear weapons capability as a strategy to put pressure on the United States to reverse its objectionable strategic posture in East Asia. However, the ROC leadership was relatively unwilling to develop a missile capability as part of the military nuclear program. In addition, ROC leadership was relatively divided over the necessity of developing a nuclear weapons capability. The two points suggests that Taiwan's leadership was relatively less committed than their ROK counterpart to the pursuit of a military nuclear program against the US strategic interests. This explains why Washington found it relatively easy

to force Taiwan to abandon its objectionable military behavior. In contrast, the leadership of South Korea was so committed to the pursuit of nuclear and missile programs that it sustained the programs even under Washington's pressure.

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This research was planned to explore how a regional state could improve its security during the time of its patron's strategic retrenchment. What made this author interested in this research topic was an empirical puzzle that is found in the security-seeking behaviors of the US allies in Northeast Asia during the time of the Nixon administration's strategic retrenchment in the 1970s. The present research found that Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan did not respond to the US strategic retrenchment in a uniform fashion. Rather, each state responded quite differently to promote security under the superpower's retrenchment. Why did they develop such different behaviors?

To solve this empirical puzzle, the present research introduced a theory of a regional state's security-promoting behaviors during the time of its patron's retrenchment. The theory is composed of three sections: operationalization of a regional state's security concern, a theory of a regional state's security-promoting domestic drives, and a theory of a regional ally's pursuit of a military policy against the strategic interests of its patron. The theory was tested against the context of the security-seeking behaviors of the US regional allies in Northeast Asia during the time of the US strategic retrenchment during the 1970s.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows. The next section reviews the theory and research strategy of this study. In the third section, I synthesize the main empirical findings regarding how each of the regional allies' security assessment affected the security-seeking domestic and military behaviors during the 1970s. The fourth section discusses the implications that can be drawn from this research, with particular focus on the context of the security relationship between a superpower and its regional allies. In the fifth section, I will suggest an agenda for future research. Then a final section suggests a few notes to conclude this study.

5.2. Review of Theory and Research Design

The theory of this research operationally defined a regional state's perception of security under the patron's retrenchment. Rather than simply considering the state's security concern as the fear of abandonment, the theory treats it as a combination of a regional state's perception of patron reliability and its perception of military threats posed by the adversary. This helped to discuss the level of a regional state's security concern as a continuous variable.

This study introduced three methods to infer each regional state's security assessment. The primary method of inference was qualitative analysis of the written and spoken statements of each state's leadership regarding its adversary's military threats and its patron's reliability. Ideally speaking, I should have solely used each leadership's statements in measuring each state's security concern. Because of the limited availability of the primary source data, however, this study needed to introduce alternative methods

to make inference of the state leadership's perception of security. In this respect, the case study referred to primary source documents and secondary source literature that contain information on each state leadership's perception of security in response to the Nixon administration's retrenchment. It also referred to the development of the security environment each regional state directly faced, because this method provides circumstantial evidence to make inference of each state's assessment of security.

This study argued that a regional state's security concern will lead the state's leadership to introduce domestic drives to increase societal contribution to its autonomous defense posture. Then it was theorized that there is co-variation between the level of a regional state's security concern and the scope of its efforts to increase domestic contribution to an autonomous defense capability.

To measure the state's security-promoting domestic drives, this study examined a change in defense spending as a share of national income because this is a straightforward way to measure the scope of a state's domestic drives to increase the societal contribution to an autonomous defense posture. But it also acknowledged that this quantitative indicator may not reflect the precise level of a regional state's security concern under the patron's retrenchment. In this respect, the present study used other qualitative indicators to measure the security-seeking behaviors. It examined each state leadership's initiative to direct domestic resources toward autonomous defense capability because it is the essential strategy to increase the domestic contribution to autonomous defense. It also examined whether each leadership tried to mobilize domestic support under the initiative of national security. The case study used the quantitative and

qualitative indicators in comparing the selected states' responses to the Nixon administration's retrenchment in Northeast Asia.

The present study also theorized that a regional state's pursuit of military policies against its patron's strategic interests is a function of its security assessment during the security provider's retrenchment. According to the theory, a regional state is supposed to maintain deferential behaviors toward its patron when it does not negatively assess the security implication of the patron's strategic posture. As its security concern increases under the patron's retrenchment, however, the theory expected that a regional state pursues military policies against the patron's strategic interests to pressure the security provider to reverse course. According to the theory, it was hypothesized that there is co-variation between the level of a regional state's negative assessment of security and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy that jeopardizes the strategic interests of its security provider.

The case study used the following three qualitative indicators to measure the level of each regional state's commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against its patron. First, it measured the compatibility between each of the regional states' military behaviors and the US's strategic interests in Northeast Asia. Second, the study examined the level of internal cohesion within the leadership of the regional states when pursuing a military policy against the US strategic interests. Third, it examined how each of the regional states responded to the US's coercive efforts to reverse the military behaviors against its strategic interests.

This study suggested two points to justify why the theory of a regional state's security-seeking behaviors should be tested against the context of how the three regional

allies responded to the Nixon administration's strategic retrenchment. First, it is arguably difficult to find substantial variation among them in terms of the level of security concern under the superpower's strategic retrenchment because each of them was highly dependent upon the patron's military protection. In this respect, each of them is arguably a hard case to test the theory of this research that argues that the level of a regional state's security concern is the most proximate cause to explain different security-seeking behaviors among regional allies. Second, the case selection arguably isolates the causal link between the US strategic posture and the regional allies' security-seeking behaviors. Each of the states could not find an alternative source of allied support under the superpower's retrenchment. In addition, because the three regional states are located in the same geopolitical area, the case selection helps to control for factors at the level of international system that have the potential to affect each of the regional state's perception of security.

5.3. Synthesis of Empirical Findings

There were two research questions that the case study answered. First, was there covariation between the levels of security concern expressed by each US ally in Northeast Asia and the scope of each ally's domestic drives to increase domestic contribution to autonomous defense capability in response to the Nixon administration's strategic retrenchment? Second, was there covariation between the level of security concern and the level of each ally's commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against the US strategic interests?

To answer the two questions, each case study examined the level of security concern expressed by Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan under the Nixon administration's military retrenchment in East Asia and the development of the Sino-American rapprochement. The case study of Japan found that Japan was anxious about the US reliability. But it also found that the development of the security environment during the 1970s substantially mitigated Japan's security concern. In contrast, the case study of South Korea found that the ROK leadership was highly skeptical of the US reliability in response to the Nixon administration's force reduction. In addition, the leadership of South Korea believed that North Korea would make use of the Nixon administration's strategic posture for its revisionist purposes. The case study of Taiwan found that the ROC leadership was highly skeptical of the US reliability under the development of the Sino-American rapprochement. But it also found that Taiwan's threat perception of the communist China came to be mitigated as a result of the state leadership's belief that the adversary's offensive military strategy was constrained by the Sino-Soviet conflict and the development of Sino-American rapprochement.

According to the case study, the Japanese leadership experienced substantially low level of security concern while the ROK leadership experienced substantially high level of security concern in response to the Nixon administration's strategic posture in Northeast Asia. In this respect, Japan was at one end of the spectrum while South Korea was at the other end of the spectrum, if we compare them in terms of the level of security concern. Then the case study of Taiwan found that the level of Taiwan's security concern is estimated to be relatively higher than that of Japan but lower than that of South Korea.

The case study examined each regional ally's domestic drives to promote societal contribution to autonomous defense. The case study of Japan found that the Japanese leadership restrained itself from introducing domestic drives to promote a societal contribution to autonomous defense capability. This was the result of the establishment of a minimalist defense posture during the 1970s. In contrast, the case study of South Korea found that the leadership of South Korea introduced all-out efforts to promote societal contribution to autonomous defense. According to the case study, the ROK government made efforts to gain rapid access to national resources. It also pushed for heavy industrialization, which was the state's mobilization strategy to produce the required defense materials through the development of targeted strategic industries. Furthermore, the ROK regime introduced the Saemaŭl Movement and the Yushin system, which were targeted to mobilize societal support of the heavy industrialization project. The case study of Taiwan found that the ROC government pushed for the heavy industrialization as an alternative to the US industrial base that it had relied upon for defense. But the case study also found the ROC leadership did not introduce a policy instrument of extraction that was targeted to gain rapid access to domestic resources. It also found that the ROC government decreased the portion of the government's budget allocated to defense spending while increasing the portion allocated to the state's long-term objectives. The ROC government also balanced security and economic rationale while introducing the heavy industrialization drive. In addition, the case study found that the ROC regime did not mobilize social support under the initiative of national security.

To summarize, comparison of empirical findings from the case study supported the existence of covariation between the levels of each regional state's security concern and

the scope of the state leadership's security-promoting domestic drives. The case study documented that the Japanese leadership's security assessment during the détente period led to the establishment of a minimalist posture to security while the substantially high level of security concern made the leadership of South Korea try to establish a maximalist posture to defense. The case study also found that the degree of the ROC leadership's security-promoting domestic drives was relatively higher than that of the Japanese leadership but was relatively lower than that of the ROK counterpart.

The case study also examined whether each of the regional allies pursued a military policy against US strategic interests. The case study of Japan found that the Japanese government voluntarily ratified the NPT to ensure that Japan would not pursue nuclear armament, despite its capability and the existence of a motive to pursue nuclear weapons. The government also institutionalized defense cooperation with the United States. In contrast, the case study of South Korea found that the ROK leadership pursued military policies which placed the superpower's strategic interests at risk. The ROK government tried to develop a missile capability, even beyond the scope allowed by the superpower. This jeopardized the patron's strategic interests to sustain the status-quo in the Korean peninsula. The ROK government also began to develop an autonomous nuclear weapon capability, which was evidently against the US strategy to stabilize the NPT system. The case study of Taiwan found that the ROC leadership began to develop a nuclear weapon capability which was against the US policy to place the Sino-American relations on a nonconfrontational basis. But the case study also found that the leadership of Taiwan was internally divided over the necessity for the military nuclear program and that the ROC

government did not develop its missile program beyond the initial stage, as it faced US pressure.

The empirical findings from the case study supported the existence of covariation between the levels of each regional state's security concern and the level of its commitment to the pursuit of a military policy against the US strategic interests. First, the case study found that Japan was not committed to the pursuit of a military policy that would jeopardize the US strategic interests. Rather, the Japanese government chose to develop its military behaviors in the direction favored by the United States. This finding lent support to the argument that a regional state is supposed to maintain deferential behaviors toward its patron when it does not negatively assess the security implication of the patron's strategic posture. Second, given the ROK leadership's substantially higher level of security concern, it was hypothesized that South Korea was strongly committed to the pursuit of a military policy that jeopardized the US strategic interests. The empirical findings supported this hypothesis. Third, the case of Taiwan found that the ROC leadership was more committed than the Japanese counterpart but was less committed than the ROK counterpart to the pursuit of a military policy that went against the US strategic interests.

5.4. Implication

This study suggested the theory of a regional state's security-seeking behaviors based upon criticism of existing scholarship on asymmetric alliance. In this respect, there are several points to discuss regarding how the present study contributes to the existing scholarship. In addition, the case study suggested several empirical findings that help us to better understand the security relationship between the US and its regional allies in Northeast Asia. This section discusses three points regarding the implications of this research.

First, this study suggests that a regional state's assessment of security leads to a dynamic of conflict and cooperation in the security relationship between the regional state and its superpower patron. This study suggests that a regional state's choice between the contrasting military behaviors toward its patron is a function of its assessment of security in response to the patron's retrenchment. Then the case study finds that South Korea and Taiwan commonly pursued military nuclear programs, which led to conflict between the superpower and the regional allies. In contrast, the Japanese leadership directed the state's military policies to honor the patron's strategic interests. This led to the development of military cooperation between the US and Japan.

A second point is about the role of perception in the dynamic of cooperation between a regional state and its superpower patron when they do not agree how to interpret security environment. In this respect, the case study of Korea finds that the different perception of the security environment led to conflict between the US and South Korea during the 1970s. US policymakers believed that North Korea would not launch a

full-scale military provocation and that South Korea would be able to counter North Korea's military provocations. This belief led to Washington's conclusion that the Nixon administration's force reduction policy would not affect the overall balance of power in the Korean peninsula. In addition, the Nixon administration believed that the development of détente in the Korean peninsula would ease tension in the Korean peninsula. However, the US assessment of security was substantially different from that of the South Korean leadership. The case study finds that ROK government persistently emphasized North Korea's revisionist purpose in the Korean peninsula. Because of this concern, the ROK leadership believed that the US force reduction would inevitably lead to the adversary's initiation of a revisionist war against South Korea. Even the development of détente in the Korean peninsula did not change the ROK's threat perception. Rather, the ROK leadership expressed the belief that North Korea would make use of the détente for its revisionist purpose and that the Nixon administration's rapprochement with communist China would negatively affect the security of South Korea. Because of the perception of security, the leadership did not agree with the superpower's strategic posture and even pursued military policies that would jeopardize the patron's strategic interests. In response, Washington criticized the ROK leadership's security assessment and pressured the regional ally to reverse the objectionable military behaviors.

Lastly, this study suggests that the role of perception needs to be fully integrated into the existing scholarship on the second-image reversed logic. According to this scholarship, the imperative of security competition under the anarchic setting of international politics induces states to organize themselves internally in order to meet

external threats. While following this logic, the present study suggests that the causal effect of anarchy should be mediated by a state's perception of security. The case study of Korea finds that the ROK leadership's movement to control domestic society was a result of its perception of insecurity in response to the Nixon administration's retrenchment. But the case study of Japan finds that the Japanese leadership's assessment of security led the Japanese government to refrain from changing the existing state-society relationship. The case study of Taiwan also found that the absence of the ROC government's movement to control domestic society, given the state leadership's modest level of security concern. To summarize, the comparative analysis suggests that a superpower's retrenchment can be discussed as an external factor to affect the state-society relationship of its regional allies when the regional states are highly sensitive to the superpower's strategic retrenchment.

5.5. Recommendation for Future Research

This research supported the theory of a regional state's security-seeking behaviors by studying the security-seeking behaviors of US allies in the Northeast Asia. In this respect, one may suggest that whether the theory can be introduced into the explanation of a regional ally in another regional context. This research acknowledges the necessity to test the external validity of the main arguments of this research.

First, testing external validity of the theory needs to consider how to test it against a regional state which finds it relatively easy to find alternative sources of allied support. For example, it may be argued that a study should test the theory against a regional state under multipolarity, because this state may find it relatively easier to secure alternative

sources of allied support than another regional state under the structure of bipolarity or unipolarity. This research could also be tested against the US allies in Western Europe. The presence of institutionalized military cooperation in this region makes each of the regional allies relatively less sensitive to the superpower's strategic retrenchment than the US allies in Northeast Asia that do not enjoy benefits of the institutionalized military cooperation.

It also needs to be noted that the three cases examined did not witness a substantial level of domestic opposition to the state's formulation of defense posture. The case selection helps to control for the neoclassical realist perspective that a regional state's willingness to introduce security-promoting domestic drives is constrained by its relationship with domestic society. This helps to highlight the realist version of the state as a rational actor in the security studies that introduces security-promoting behaviors according to its assessment of security. Thus this research supports the state's assumed privileged international position and the realist characterization of the state as an agent that possesses a realm of autonomous behavior in conducting foreign policy.[1] It also characterizes the state as "a well-established public arena that is both normatively and organizationally distinguishable from private interests and pursuits."[2]

As a neoclassical realist points out, however, it may be hard to support the notion of the realist version of rational state in the context of contemporary security studies.[3] In

---

[1] Mastanduno, Lake, and Ikenberry, "Toward a Realist Theory of State Action," 460.
[2] Kohli, *State-Directed Development*, 9.
[3] In this respect, Schweller (2009, 249) points out that Waltz's neorealist version of the principle of the balance of powers explains the golden age of the balance of power, which occurred from 1648 to the Napoleonic era, when: "(1) the state truly was an individual, and therefore fit the realist assumption of a unitary, intentional actor, (2) the state floated above society rather than being integrated with it, and (3) war between states overlaid rather than engulfed the lives of average citizens."

this respect, the present research acknowledges that the state-society relationship in South Korea and Taiwan has substantially changed as a result of democratization. This suggests that the two states' security-seeking behaviors are likely to be constrained by the state's relationship with domestic society.[4] In addition, Japan's security policy during the 1970s was a deviant case for the antimilitarist model. Considering these points, it may not be easy to support the notion of the realist version of rational state in the contemporary context of the three states.

This criticism suggests that the theory of this research needs to address how the state-society relationship affects a regional state's security-seeking behaviors, particularly when the state leadership and domestic society disagree about the security implication of its patron's strategic retrenchment. The disagreement is likely to occur because the state leadership is usually "responsible for long-term grand strategic planning including the identification of changes in the global and regional balance of power" while societal elites are "primarily concerned about immediate shifts in the domestic balance of political power."[5] Given the different emphases, the state leadership is unable to adopt policies

---

[4] Benson and Niou discuss this point in the context of Taiwan's independence movement. Sterling-Folker examines state-society relationship in Taiwan to explain why Taiwan sustained military competition with the mainland China despite the development of economic interdependence during the 1990s, which is an anomaly to the liberal interdependence literature. See Brett V. Benson and Emerson M. S. Niou, "Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and the Security Balance in the Taiwan Strait, Security Studies," *Security Studies* 14, no. 2: 274-89; Jenifer Sterling-Folker, "Neoclassical Realism and Identity: Peril despite Profit across the Taiwan Strait," in *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2009), 99-138.

[5] Steven E. Lobell, "Threat Assessment, the State, and Foreign Policy: A Neoclassical Realist Model," in *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 45-6. To discuss how the disagreement between the state and domestic society affects the state's balancing strategy, Lobell suggests "a complex threat identification model" which outlines "the nested and multitiered nature of threat assessment." Then he argues that the complex nature of threat assessment will make it the case that what matters in a state's balancing strategy are "shifts in specific components of the rising state's power rather than shifts in aggregate power alone."

that are consistent with its preferred strategies when it is substantially penetrated by domestic society or faced with a substantial level of societal opposition.[6] In contrast, the state leadership is likely to make the state's policy consistent with its preferred strategies when it is able to override domestic opposition. The same also holds true if domestic society does not offer any substantial resistance to the strategies adopted by political leaders.[7] To conclude, the dynamic of the state-society relationship should be fully addressed in a study of a regional state's security-promoting behaviors in response to its patron's strategic posture.

---

[6] Regarding this situation, Christensen suggests a two-step approach that helps to determine the effects that state's relationship with domestic society may have on the state's implementation of a predetermined optimal policy package in response to external security environments. This approach begins with discussing which policy options the leadership would prefer if it enjoyed an ideal state-society environment. Then it discusses "the degree to which state-society relations distort leaders' preferred policies depends on the height of the domestic political obstacles facing those leaders." Regarding the two-step approach, see Christensen, *Useful Adversaries*, 24-5.

[7] Ibid., 20-1.

5.6. Chapter Conclusion

No one may object to the argument that a superpower's strategic retrenchment affects the security of its regional allies. But this argument should be demonstrated. Existing scholarship pays littles attention to elaborating on how a regional state's security concern under its patron's strategic retrenchment affects its choice of strategy to promote security. This criticism led the present study to theorize a regional state's strategy to promote security in response to its patron's strategic retrenchment. Then the case study of the US regional allies in Northeast Asia documented each regional ally's strategy to increase security under the Nixon administration's strategic retrenchment. I believe that the present research demonstrated that a superpower's strategic posture indeed affected security-seeking behaviors of its regional allies.

What is the relevance of this research in the context of the unipolar system where the United States has sustained the global hegemony? There may be the chance that the superpower will be tempted to retrench militarily in the face of a decline in her relative power vis-à-vis other major powers and domestic public attitudes hostile to high level of global military commitment. Facing pressures from the international and domestic situations, the superpower may introduce another Nixon Doctrine. This will be a chance to test the empirical validity of the theory suggested in this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, David and Corey Gay. 1998. “Taiwan: Nuclear nightmare averted.” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 54 (1): 54-60.

Altfeld, Michael F. 1984. “The Decision to Ally: A Theory and a Test.” *Western Political Quarterly* 37 (4): 523-544.

Amsden, Alice H. 1985. “The State and Taiwan’s Economic Development.” In *Bringing the State Back in,* eds. Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 78-106.

Amsden, Alice. 1989. *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ayako, Kusunoki. 2008. “The Sato Cabinet and the Making of Japan's Non-Nuclear Policy.” *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 15 (Special Volume): 25-50.

Bandow, Doug. 1996. *Tripwire: Korea and U.S. Foreign Policy in a Changed World*. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute.

Barnett, Michael N. 1990. “High Politics is Low Politics: The Domestic and Systemic Sources of Israeli Security Policy, 1967-1977.” *World Politics* 42 (4): 529-62.

Barnett, Michael N. and Jack S. Levy. 1991. “Domestic Sources of Alliances and Alignments: The Case of Egypt, 1962-73.” *International Organization* 45 (3): 369-95.

Beeson, Mark 2009. “Developmental States in East Asia: A Comparison of the Japanese and Chinese Experiences.” *Asian Perspective* 33 (2): 5-39.

Bellow, Thomas J. 1976.” Taiwan’s Foreign Policy in the 1970s: A Case Study of Adaptation and Viability.” *Asian Survey* 16 (7): 593-610.

Benson, Brett V. and Emerson M. S. Niou. 2005. “Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and the Security Balance in the Taiwan Strait, Security Studies.” *Security Studies* 14 (2): 274-89.

Berger, Thomas U. 1998. *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bobrow, Davis B. 1989. “Japan in the World: Opinion from Defeat to Success.*” Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33 (4): 571-604.

Brooks, Stephen G. 1997. “Dueling Realisms.” *International Organization* 51 (3): 445-77.

Buckley, Roger. 1992. *US-Japan Alliance Diplomacy 1945-1990*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Burr, William. 1999. *New Archival Evidence on Taiwanese "Nuclear Intentions", 1966-1976.* The National Security Archive. Electronic Briefing Book 221. http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB20/ (Accessed March 6, 2015).

Burr, William. 2007. *The Nuclear Vault*. The National Security Archive. Electronic Briefing Book No. 221. http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb221/ (Accessed March 6, 2015).

Calder, Kent E. 1988. *Crisis and Compensation: Public Policy and Political Stability in Japan, 1949-1986*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carr, Edward Hallet. 1964. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan.

Cha, Victor D. 1999. *Alignment Despite Antagonism: The United States-Korea-Japan Security Triangle*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cha, Victor. 2000. “Abandonment, Entrapment, and Neoclassical Realism in Asia: The United States, Japan, and Korea.” *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (2): 261-91.

Cha, Victor. 2009/10. “Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia.” *International Security* 34 (3): 158-96.

Chai, Sun-Ki. 1997. “Entrenching the Yoshida Defense Doctrine: Three Techniques for Institutionalization.” *International Organization* 51 (3): 389-412.

Chan, Steve 1992. “Military Burden, Economic Growth, and Income Inequality: The Taiwan Exception.” In *Defense, Welfare and Growth: Perspectives and Evidence*, eds. Steve Chan and Alex Mintz. New York: Routledge, 163-178.

Cheng, Tun-Jen. 1989. “Democratizing the Quasi-Leninist Regime in Taiwan.” *World Politics* 41 (4): 471-99.

Christensen, Thomas J. 1996. *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Christensen, Thomas J. 1999. “China, the U.S-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia.” *International Security* 23 (4): 49-80.

Christensen, Thomas J. and Jack Snyder. 1990. “Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity.” *International Organization* 44 (2): 137-68.

Clough, Ralph N. 1976. *Deterrence and Defense in Korea: The Role of U.S. Forces*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.

Clough, Ralph N. 1978. *Island China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cole, Bernard D. 2006. *Taiwan’s Security: History and Prospects*. New York: Routledge.

Crawford, Timothy W. 2011. “Preventing Enemy Coalitions: How Wedge Strategies Shape Power Politics.” *International Security* 35 (4): 155-89.

Curtis, Gerald. 1979. “Domestic Politics and Japanese Foreign Policy.” In *Japan and the United States: Challenges and Opportunities*, ed. William J. Brands. New York: New York University Press, 21-85.

Desch, Michael C. 1996. “War and Strong States, Peace and Weak States?” *International Organization* 50 (2): 237-68.

Dittmer, Lowell. 1981. “The Strategic Triangle: An Elementary Game-Theoretical Analysis.” *World Politics* 33 (4): 485-515.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. "Case studies and theory in political science," In *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 7, eds. Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 79-138.

Evangelista, Matthew. 1989. “Issue-Area and Foreign Policy Revisited.” *International Organization* 43 (1): 147-71.

Feldman, Harvey, Michael Y.M. Kau, and Ilpyong J. Kim. 1988. *Taiwan in a Time of Transition*. New York: Paragon House.

Friedberg, Aaron L. 1992. “Why Didn't the United States become a Garrison State?” *International Security* 16 (4): 109-42.

Friedberg, Aaron L. 2000. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America’s Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Garver, John W. 1997. *The Sino-American Alliance: Nationalist China and American Cold War Strategy in Asia*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Gelpi, Christopher 1999. “Alliances as Instruments of Intra-Allied Control,” In *Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions over Time and Space,* eds. Helga Haftendorn, Robert. O. Keohane, and Celeste A. Wallander. New York: Oxford University Press, 107-139.

George, Alexander L. and Bennett, Andrew. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Gibney, Frank. 1977. “The Ripple Effect in Korea.” *Foreign Affairs* 56 (1): 160-175.

Goldstein, Avery. 1995. “Discounting the Free Ride: Alliances and Security in the Postwar World.” *International Organization* 49 (1): 39-71.

Gourevitch, Peter. 1978. “The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics.” *International Organization* 32 (4): 881-912.

Green, Michael J. 1995. *Arming Japan: Defense Production, Alliance Politics, and the Postwar Search for Autonomy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Green, Michael J. 2003. *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an Era of Uncertain Power*. New York: Palgrave.

Greene, Megan J. 2008. *The Origins of Developmental State in Taiwan: Science Policy and the Quest for Modernization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gregor, A. James. 1984. "Republic of China." In *Arms Production in Developing Countries, ed.* James E. Katz. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 301-320.

Harrison, Selig S. 1996. “Japan and Nuclear Weapons.” In *Japan’s Nuclear Future: The Plutonium Debate and East Asian Security*, ed. Selig S. Harrison. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3-44.

Hoey, Fintan. 2012. “The Nixon Doctrine and Nakasone Yasuhiro’s Unsuccessful Challenge to Japan’s Defense Policy, 1969-1971.” *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 19 (1): 52-74.

Hook, Glenn D. 1996. *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan*. New York: Routledge.

Hong, Seuk-Ryule. 2001. “1968nyŏn Pueblo Sageongwa Namhan, Bukan, Migugui Samgakgwangye.” ["The Pueblo Crisis in 1968 and the Triangular Relations among South Korea, North Korea, and the United States."] *Hanguksayeongu* 133: 179-208.

Hong, Sung Gul. 2011. “The Search for Deterrence: Park’s Nuclear Option,” In *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra E. Vogel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 483-510.

Hughes, Christopher. 2004. *Japan’s Re-emergence as a “Normal” Military Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Huth, K. Paul. 1988. “Extended Deterrence and the Outbreak of War.” *American Political Science Review* 82 (2): 423-43.

Ikenberry, John G. 2001. *After Victory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Im, Hyuk Baeg. 2011. “The Origin of the Yushin Regime: Machiavelli Unveiled.” In *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra E. Vogel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 233-261.

Ito, Go. 2003. *Alliance in Anxiety: Détente and the Sino-American-Japanese Triangle*. New York: Routledge.

Izumikawa, Yasuhiro. 2010. “Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan’s Security Policy.” *International Security* 35 (2): 123-60.

Jentleson, Bruce W., and Christopher A. Whytock. 2005/06. “Who "Won" Libya? The Force-Diplomacy Debate and Its Implications for Theory and Policy.” *International Security* 30 (3): 47-86.

Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jo, Dong-Joon and Erik Gartzke. 2007. “Determinants of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51 (1): 167-194.

Kase. Yuri. 2001. “The Costs and Benefits of Japan’s Nuclearization: An Insight into the 1968/70 Internal Report.” *The Nonproliferation Review* 8 (2): 55-68.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. *Cultural Norms and National Security: Policy and Military in Postwar Japan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 2008. *Rethinking Japanese Security: Internal and External Dimensions*. New York: Routledge.

Katzenstein, Peter J. and Nobuo Okawara. 1993. “Japan’s National Security: Structures, Norms, and Policies.” *International Security* 17 (4): 84-118.

Katzenstein, Peter J. and Nobuo Okawara. 2000/01. “Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism.” *International Security* 26 (3): 153-85.

Kau, Michael Ying-mao. 1996. “The Power Structure in Taiwan's Political Economy.” *Asian Survey* 36 (3): 287-305.

Kawasaki, Tsuyoshi. 2001. “Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy.” *Pacific Review* 14 (2): 221-40.

Keddell, Joseph P. 1993. *The Politics of Defense in Japan: Managing Internal and External Pressures*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Kim, Byung-Kook. 2011. “The Leviathan: Economic Bureaucracy under Park.” In *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, eds. Byung-Kook Kim and Ezra E. Vogel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 200-232.

Kim, Byung-Kook, and Vogel, Ezra F. 2011. *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kim, Hyung-A. 2003. *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee*: *Rapid Industrialization, 1961-1979*. New York: Routledge.

Kim, Jin-Ki. 2008. “Hanguk Bangwisaneobui Baljeonjeollyake Daehan Yeongu: Pakchŏnghŭi Sidaeui Bangwisaneob Baljeonjeollyakeul Jungsimeulo.” [“A Study of the South Korea’s Strategy to Develop Defense Industry: Case Study of the Park Chung Hee Era.”] *Gukgajeollyak* 14 (1): 95-121.

Kim, Seung-Young. 2001. “Security, Nationalism and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles: The South Korean Case, 1970–82.” *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 12 (4): 53-80.

Kim, Sung-Chull. 2014. “Sino-Japanese Normalization and Japan’s Korean Policy, 1972-75.” In *The Koreas between China and Japan,* eds. Teo Victor, and Geun Lee Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 42-62.

Kohli, Atul. 2004. *State-Directed Development: Political Power and Industrialization in the Global Periphery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Komine, Yukinori. 2009. “The “Japan Card” in the United States Rapprochement with China, 1969–1972.” *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 20 (3): 494-514.

Koo, Sang Hui. 1998. *Hanguk Bangwisaneob [Korea’s Defense Industry]* Sejong Yeonguso Yeongu Nonmun 98-09. Sejong Yeonguso.

Lake, David. 1996. “Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations.” *International Organization* 50 (1): 1-33.

Lanoszka, Alexander. 2012. “Protection States Trust? Superpower Patronage, Nuclear Behavior, and Alliance Dynamics.”

https://www.princeton.edu/politics/about/file-repository/public/A-Lanoszka-Protection-States-Trust-022012.pdf (Accessed March 30, 2016).

Layne, Christopher. 1993. “The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise.” *International Security* 17 (4): 5-51.

Legro, Jeffrey W. and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” *International Security* 24 (2): 5-55.

Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson 2005. “Hegemonic Threats and Great-Power Balancing in Europe, 1495-1999.” *Security Studies* 14 (1): 1-33.

Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson. 2010. “Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally against the Leading Global Power?” *International Security* 35 (1): 7-43.

Lind, Jennifer M. 2004. “Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy.” *International Security* 29 (1): 92-121.

Lobell, Steven E. 2009. “Threat Assessment, the State, and Foreign Policy: A Neoclassical Realist Model.” In *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42-74.

Ma, Sang-Yoon. 2003 “Anbowa Minjujuui Geuligo Pakchŏnghŭiui Gil: Yusincheje Sulibwonin Jego.” [“Security, Democracy and Park Chung Hee’s Road: The Origins of the Yushin System Revisited.”] *Gukjejeongchinonchong* 43 (4): 171-96.

Macdonald, Paul K. and Joseph M. Parent. 2011. “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment." *International Security* 35 (4): 7-44.

Macmillan, Margaret. 2007. *Nixon and Mao: The Week That Changed the World*. New York: Random House.

Mastanduno, Michael, David A. Lake and John G. Ikenberry. 1989. “Toward a Realist Theory of State Action.” *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (4): 457-74.

Mearsheimer, John. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton.

Midford, Paul. 2002. “The Logic of Reassurance and Japan’s Grant Strategy.” *Security Studies* 11 (3): 1-43.

Midford, Paul. 2011. *Rethinking Japanese Public Opinion and Security: From Pacifism to Realism?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Miller, Nicholas L. 2014. “The Secret Success of Nonproliferation Sanctions.” *International Organization* 68 (4): 913-44.

Mistry, Dinshaw. 2003. *Containing Missile Proliferation Strategic Technology, Security Regimes, and International Cooperation in Arms Control*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Mitchell, Derek. 2004. “Taiwan’s Hsin Chu Project: Deterrence, Abandonment, and Honor.” In *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices*, eds. Kurt M. Campbell, Robert J. Einhorn, and Mitchell Reiss. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 293-313.

Momoi, Makato. 1977. “Basic Trends in Japanese Security Policies,” In *The Foreign Policy of Modern Japan*, ed. Robert A. Scalapino. Berkley: University of California Press, 341-64.

Moon, Chung-In and In-Taek Hyun. 1992. “Muddling through Security, Growth, and Welfare: The Political Economy of Defense Spending.” In *Defense, Welfare and Growth: Perspectives and Evidence*, eds. Steve Chan and Alex Mintz. New York: Routledge, 137-62.

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Moorsteen, Richard and Morton Abramowitz. 1971. *Remaking China Policy: U.S.-China Relations and Governmental Decisionmaking*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1966. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.

Morrow, James D. 1991. “Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances." *American Journal of Political Science* 35-4: 904-33.

Morrow, James D. 1993. “Arms versus Allies: Tradeoffs in the Search for Security.” *International Organization* 47 (2): 207-33.

Morrow, James D. 2000. “Alliances: Why Write Them Down?” *Annual Review of Political Science* 3 (June): 63-83.

Nam, Joo-Hong. 1986. *America’s Commitment to South Korea: The First Decade of the Nixon Doctrine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nakasone, Yasuhiro. 1999. *The Making of the New Japan: Reclaiming the Political Mainstream*. Trans. Lesley Connors. New York: Routledge.

Narizny, Kevin. 2003. “Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament.” *American Political Science Review* 97 (2): 203-20.

Nixon, Richard M. 1967. “Asia after Vietnam.” *Foreign Affairs* 46 (1): 111-25.

Nixon, Richard M. 1978. *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Nolan, Janne E. 1986. *Military Industry in Taiwan and South Korea*. London: Macmillan.

Nordhaug, Kristen. 1997. “Development through Want of Security: The Case of Taiwan.” *Pacific Focus* 7 (1): 129-61.

Oberdorfer, Don 2001. *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History*. New York: Basic Books.

Oh, Won Chul. 1999. *Naega jeonjaengeul hajaneun geotdo aniji anhneunya [I am not Planning a War]. HanGukhyeong* Gyeongjejeongchaek Yeonguso

Osgood, Robert E. 1968. *Alliances and American Foreign Policy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pan, Liang. 2007. “Whither Japan’s Military Potential? The Nixon Administration’s Stance on Japanese Defense Power.” *Diplomatic History* 31 (1): 111-42.

Park, Chung Hee. 1979. *Korea Reborn: A Model for Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Phillips, Lewis Reese. 1993. “The Origins of Taiwan’s Trade and Industrial Policies.” Ph.D.diss. Columbia University.

Pollack, Jonathan D. and Mitchell B. Reiss. 2004. “South Korea: The Tyranny of Geography and the Vexations of History.” In *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider Their Nuclear Choices*, eds. Kurt M. Campbell, Robert J. Einhorn, and Mitchell B. Reiss. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 254-92.

Posen, Barry R. 1993. “Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power.” *International Security* 18 (2): 80-124.

Press-Barnathan, Galia. 2006. “Managing the Hegemon: NATO under Unipolarity.” *Security Studies* 15 (2): 271-309.

Pyle, Kenneth B. 2007. *Japan Rising: The Resurgence of Japanese Power and Purpose*. New York: Public Affairs.

Ravenal, Earl G. 1971. “The Nixon Doctrine and Our Asian Commitments.” *Foreign Affairs* 49 (2): 201-17.

Resende-Santos, Joao. 2007. *Neorealism, States, and the Modern Mass Army*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rigger, Shelley.1999. *Politics in Taiwan: Voting for Democracy*. New York: Routledge.

Rose, Gideon. 1998. “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy.” *World Politics* 51 (1): 144-72.

Sagan, Scott D. 1996/97. “Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb.” *International Security* 21 (3): 54-86.

Samuels, Richard J. 2007. *Securing Japan: Tokyo’s Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schaller, Michael. 1997. *Altered States: The United States and Japan since the Occupation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schroeder, Paul. 1976. “Alliances, 1815-1945: Weapons of Power and Tools of Management.” In *Historical Dimensions of National Security Problems*, ed. Klaus Knorr. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 227-262.

Schroeder, Paul. 1994. “Historical Reality vs. Neo-realist Theory.” *International Security* 19 (1): 108-48.

Schwartz, Thomas A. 1995. “The United States and Germany after 1945: Alliances, Transnational Relations, and the Legacy of the Cold War.” *Diplomatic History* 19 (4): 549-68.

Schweller, Randall L. 2004. "Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing." *International Security* 29 (2): 159-201.

Schweller, Randall L. 2006. *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Schweller, Randall L. 2009. “Neoclassical Realism and State Mobilization, Expansionist Ideology in the Age of Mass Politics.” In *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 227-50.

Sebata, Takao. 2010. *Japan’s Defense Policy and Bureaucratic Politics, 1976-2007*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Shen, James C. H. 1984. *The U.S. & Free China: How the U.S. Sold Out Its Ally*. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books

Shin, Wookhee. 2010. *Suneunggwa Jeohangeul Neomeoseo: Iseungmangwa Pakchŏnghŭiui Daemijeongchaeg [Beyond Compliance and Resistance: The Policies of Syngman Rhee and Park Chung Hee toward the United States]*. Seouldaehakgyo Chulpanmunhwawon.

Siler, Michael J. 1998. “The U.S. Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy in the Northeast Asian Region During the Cold War: The South Korean Case.” *East Asia:* 16 (3/4): 41–86.

Skocpol, Theda. 1985. “Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research.” In *Bringing the State Back In,* eds. Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-37.

Snyder, Glenn H. 1984. "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics." *World Politics* 36 (4): 461-95.

Snyder, Glenn H. 1996. “Process variables in neorealist theory.” *Security Studies* 5 (3): 167-92.

Snyder, Glenn. 2002. “Mearsheimer’s World: Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security.” *International Security* 27 (1): 149-73.

Solingen, Etel. 2007. *Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sorely, Lewis. 1983. *Arms Transfers under Nixon*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Sorokin, Gerald L. 1994. “Arms, Alliances, and Security Tradeoffs in Enduring Rivalries.” *International Studies Quarterly* 38 (3): 421-46.

Sterling-Folker, Jennifer. 2009. “Neoclassical Realism and Identity: Peril despite Profit across the Taiwan Strait.” In *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy*, eds. Steven E, Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 99-138.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey W. 2000/01. “Security Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited.” *International Security* 25 (3): 128-61.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey W. 2006. “State Building for Future Wars: Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State.” *Security Studies* 15 (3): 464-95.

Taylor, Jay. 2000. *The Generalissimo's Son: Chiang Ching-kuo and the Revolutions in China and Taiwan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Temerson, Timothy. D. 1992. *Double Containment and the Origins of the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance*. Center for International Studies. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. http://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/17094/JP-WP-91-14-25982229.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed March 6, 2016).

Tien, Hung-mao. 1975. "Taiwan in Transition: Prospects for Socio-Political Change," *The China Quarterly* 64 (December): 615-644.

Tien, Hung-mao. 1988. "Social Change and Political Development in Taiwan." In *Taiwan in a Time of Transition,* eds. Harvey Feldman, and Ilpyong J. Kim. New York: Paragon House, 1-37.

Tien, Hung-mao. 1989. *The Great Transition: Political and Social Change in the Republic of China.* Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf. 2005. "Taiwan Expendable? Nixon and Kissinger Go to China." *The Journal of American History* 92 (1): 109-35.

Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf. 2009. *Strait Talk: United States-Taiwan Relations and the Crisis with China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Twomey, Christopher P. 2000. "Japan, A Circumscribed Balancer: Building on Defensive Realism to Make Predictions about East Asian Security." *Security Studies* 9 (4): 167-205.

Wade, Robert. 1990. *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Walt, Stephen M. 1990. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Walt, Stephen M. 1997. "Why alliances endure or collapse." *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy* 39 (1): 156-79.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Random House.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 1993. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics." *International Security* 18 (2): 44-79.

Wang, Vincent We-Cheng. 2008. “Taiwan: Conventional Deterrence, Soft Power, and the Nuclear Option.” In *The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia*, ed. Muthiah Alagappa. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 404-28.

Welfield, John. 1988. *An Empire in Eclipse: Japan in the Postwar America Alliance System*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone Press.

Winckler, Edwin A. 1984. “Institutionalization and Participation on Taiwan: From Hard to Soft Authoritarianism?” *The China Quarterly* 99 (September): 481-99.

Wohlforth, William C. 1993. *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Woo, Jung-en. 1991. *Race to the Swift: State and Finance in Korean Industrialization*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wu, Yongping. 2004. “Rethinking the Taiwanese Developmental State.” *The China Quarterly* 177 (March): 91-114.

Wu, Yongping. 2005. *A Political Explanation of Economic Growth: State Survival, Bureaucratic Politics, and Private Enterprises in the Making of Taiwan’s Economy, 1950-1985*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zakaria, Fareed. 1998. *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

VITA

VITA

Seok Ryul Kang

Department of Political Science, Purdue University

EDUCATION

Ph.D Candidate, Political Science

Purdue University, West Lafayette — Expected in August 2016

Dissertation Title: US Strategic Retrenchment and Security-Seeking Behaviors of the US Allies in Northeast Asia

Dissertation Chair: Keith L. Shimko, Associate Professor
Department of Political Science, Purdue University

Committee Members: Aaron M. Hoffman, Harry R. Targ, Eric N. Waltenburg.

Major Field: International Relations

Minor Fields: Public Policy, American Politics

M.A., International Relations.

Seoul National University, South Korea — February 2005

B.A., English Linguistics and Literature

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, South Korea — February 2002

GRANT and ASSISTANSHIP

Fulbright Grant for Ph.D Degree Program in the United States, Fall 2007 through Spring Semester 2012.

Teaching Assistantship Sponsored by the Department of Political Science at Purdue, Fall 2011 to Spring 2014.

Purdue Summer Research Grant, Summer 2013.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Teaching Assistant for Professor David Brulé's Course Entitled as "*Introduction to International Relations*," Spring Semester 2014

Teaching Assistant for Professor Keith Shimko's Course Entitled as "*Introduction to International Relations*," Fall Semester 2013

Teaching Assistant for Professor Mark Tilton's Course Entitled as "*Governments of the World*," Fall Semester 2011 through Spring Semester 2013

Research Assistant for the Research Project Entitled as "*Research Methods in Studying the Korean-American Alliance*," September 2002 through November 2004.

Research Assistant for the Research Project Entitled as "*Issues of Human Rights in North Korea from Comparative Perspective*," April 2006 through May 2007.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

"A Weak Ally's Fear of Abandonment and Entrapment and Dynamics of Conflict and Cooperation between U.S. and her Regional Allies: Theoretical Discussion and Case Study of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Military Alliance," Presented at the Annual Conference of Midwest Political Science Association in April 2013.

"Internal Balancing as the State's Security-Enhancing Strategy," Presented at the Annual Conference of International Studies Association Midwest in November 2013.

"Fear and Power: International Vulnerability and the State's Internal Balancing Strategy," Presented at the Annual Conference of Southern Political Science Association in January 2014.

"*A Regional State's Military Behaviors in Response to Her Security Patron's Strategic Posture of Retrenchments*," Presented at the Annual Conference of International Studies Association Midwest in November 2015.

"*A Regional State's Military Behaviors in Response to her Superpower Patron's Strategic Posture of Retrenchment*," Presented at the Annual Conference of Southern Political Science Association in January 2016.

"*A State's Security-Promoting Domestic Drive in Times of her Superpower Patron's Strategic Posture of Retrenchment*," Presented at the Annual Conference of Southern Political Science Association in January 2016.

"*Fear and Resistance: Security Assessment and Responses to Pressures to stop Adventurous Military Behaviors*," Presented at the Annual Conference of Midwest Political Science Association in April 2016.

"*Security Assessment and Japan's Security Policy under the Nixon Administration's Strategic Posture of Retrenchment*," Presented at the Annual Conference of Midwest Political Science Association in April 2016.

Published Non-Academic Paper

"*Analysis of the Security Relationship between the United States and Republic of Korea,*" October 1, 2003 on Joongang Daily. This article won the grand prize at the National Essay Contest on the topic of *Alliance Relationship between U. S. and South Korea*. The contest was sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea.